

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2133. By Mr. BABKA: Petition of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, relative to the \$50 bonus for the veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2134. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the City Council of Cleveland, Ohio, urging bonus for the World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2135. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of H. G. Badgerow, of Chicago, Ill., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2136. Also, petition of the National Industrial Conference Board, favoring the appointment of a commission on internal-revenue laws and taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2137. Also, petition of De Kalb (Ill.) Post, American Legion, favoring additional compensation for ex-service men of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2138. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the Dried Fruit Association of New York, indorsing the Calder bill, relative to drugs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2139. Also, petition of the Executive Council of the Association of the Seventy-eighth Division of New York, urging the passage of House bill 10835; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2140. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Dried Fruit Association of New York, favoring the passage of the Calder bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2141. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the industrial committee of the Lawrenceville Branch of the Y. M. C. A., also the executive committee and 25 prominent women residents of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging favorable report on House bill No. 12193; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2142. By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of John Liegler and other citizens of Racine, Wis., protesting against luxury tax upon articles manufactured from horse and cattle hides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2143. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of ex-officers of the One hundred and third Field Artillery of Rhode Island, urging universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2144. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Utica (N. Y.) Branch of the Polish Alliance of America, protesting against the deprivation of foreign-language publications of the use of second-class mail rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2145. Also, petition of Utica (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring support of the sane and reconstructive element in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2146. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Association of the Seventy-eighth Division, asking the passage of the Stevenson bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2147. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, asking for passage of bill and resolution for the tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2148. Also, petition of the Walter M. Gearty Post, American Legion, of Philadelphia, urging the passage of the Davey bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2149. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the North Dakota American War Mothers, relative to the soldiers' bonus, burial of soldier dead, and erection of memorial, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2150. Also, petition of 97 citizens of Temvik, N. Dak., protesting against universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, March 8, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are learning the larger lessons of life. As we stand day by day before the ever-increasing responsibilities of life, as we face responsibilities to-day, make us humble as we stand before them. Grant us grace to seek in our hearts and minds the divine guidance, that we may learn the path of larger service and wider usefulness, a path in which God will lead us in the performance of our sacred obligations. Give us the consciousness of the Divine Presence as we deal with the rights of the millions of Thy people. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, March 3, 1920, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## NAVAL AWARDS.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in yesterday's papers there appears the substance of the majority and minority reports of the subcommittee in the controversy between Admiral Sims and the Secretary of the Navy to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I would like very much to have the opportunity to read those reports, as I am sure other Senators would, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. What are the reports?

Mr. POMERENE. The reports of the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs which investigated the controversy between Admiral Sims and the Secretary of the Navy concerning naval awards.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ON THE QUESTION OF AWARDS IN THE NAVY.

On the 5th day of January, 1920, at a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate a subcommittee was appointed to investigate the question of awards in the Navy. The subcommittee was composed of Senator HALE, chairman, and Senators McCORMICK, NEWBERRY, PITTMAN, and TRAMMELL. On January 24, owing to necessary absence from Washington, Senator NEWBERRY resigned from the subcommittee, and on February 2 Senator POINDEXTER was appointed by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to fill the vacancy.

The subcommittee has held many hearings, has examined many witnesses, and after careful study of the evidence has reached the conclusions hereinafter set forth in its report.

On February 4, 1919, the Congress enacted the law providing for awards in the Navy. On January 18, prior to the passage of the act, the Bureau of Navigation issued circular letter 7-19, which appears on page — of the record of the hearings, calling for recommendations from the commanding officers and force commanders. On March 6 the Secretary, in a letter to Rear Admiral Knight, which appears on page — of the record of the hearings, appointed a board, with Rear Admiral Knight as chairman, for the purpose of "recommending to the department those persons who are, in accordance with the terms of the act of Congress approved February 4, 1919, deemed by the board worthy of the award of the medals of honor, distinguished service medals, and Navy crosses provided for in said act."

The board considered the recommendations and citations, made three reports to the Secretary of the Navy, and on October 31, 1919, was dissolved by order of the Secretary of the Navy.

The Secretary of the Navy with whom, under the President, rested the final awarding of the honors, considered the recommendations of the board of awards, in some cases approved them, in others changed them, added some names that have not been acted upon by the board, and in his annual report for the year 1919 published a list of awards to be given in the Navy. Following the publishing of this report, certain officers refused to accept the awards given them or to be given them, and Admiral Sims, who had commanded our naval forces on the other side during the war, and Admiral Mayo, who had been commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet during the war, wrote letters to the Secretary of the Navy commenting on the manner in which the awards had been made. These letters and others on the subject of awards were published in the Army and Navy Journal and other papers in the country, and editorially and otherwise there was much criticism of the awards. On December 16 the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, Senator PAGE, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Navy asking for the report of the Knight Board, and received two letters in reply, dated December 19 and January 3. These two letters and the letter of the chairman are published in the record of the hearings on pages 10 and 14. On December 24 the Secretary of the Navy ordered the board of awards, which had been dissolved the previous October, to reconvene on January 5, 1920, and that board is now in session. The order reconvening the board is found on page — of the record of the hearings.

In its hearings the subcommittee heard first certain of the officers making the recommendations for awards; second, the Knight Board of Awards; and third, the Secretary of the Navy.

In the course of the hearings certain matters not directly connected with the question of awards were brought out in the testimony of the witnesses. The subcommittee does not deem that it is within its province or powers at this time to pronounce upon these matters and will limit itself in its conclusions strictly to the question of awards. The whole purpose of the subcommittee throughout the hearings and in its report has been not to decide the personal differences between officers of the Navy or between officers of the Navy and officials of the Navy Department, but to assist in arriving at a settlement of the ques-



tion of awards in the Navy which shall be for the best interests of the Navy. Many officers and men of the Navy have performed signal and heroic service during the World War. That these officers and men shall receive recognition proportionate to their service is the sincere desire of the subcommittee.

The statute providing for awards in the Navy, which, as stated in the foregoing circular of the Bureau of Navigation, was the department's bill, leaves to the President the right to grant the awards, restricting them, however, to services of an especial kind. In view of the fact that these restrictions are not as definite as might have been the case, it is the opinion of the subcommittee that an interpretation by the Secretary of the Navy of his understanding of the statute and the course which he meant to pursue in granting the awards, or, in other words, an outline of his policy would have been helpful to the various officers of the Navy in making up their recommendations for awards. Especially would an outline of the policy of the Secretary of the Navy in regard to the importance of sea duty as compared with shore duty have been helpful, and it is the belief of the subcommittee that had such a policy been announced, fewer changes would have been necessitated in making up the list of awards.

The subcommittee finds that in making the awards no attempt was made to ascertain from the officers making the recommendations the relative merit of the cases recommended, and that the question of relative merit was not considered as it should have been. This the subcommittee regards as most unfortunate. It is of the opinion that the commanding officer of a ship is best qualified to pronounce upon the relative merits of the officers and men on his ship; that the admiral of a fleet is best qualified to judge of the relative merits of the ship commanders under him, and also the members of his staff; that the admiral in command of a station is best qualified to judge of the relative merits of the officers and men under his command; and that the same principle applies from commanders to subordinates throughout the Navy. Had such a policy prevailed in the granting of awards under the statute, the subcommittee is of the opinion that the men most entitled to awards would have received them, and that if it had been found necessary to cut down the number to receive awards the least deserving men would have been the ones to be left out.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that the failure to employ some such system in making awards has been hurtful to the morale of the Navy, and has to a certain extent depreciated the value of the awards made. That the injury to the morale of the Navy will be permanent, the subcommittee does not believe. The subcommittee believes that the spirit of the Navy is such that it will rise above any temporary blow to its morale.

The subcommittee can not too strongly condemn the practice of giving awards to commanding officers in the Navy who have lost their ships unless in such cases they shall have shown such marked heroism or such signally distinguished service as shall have made them eligible for awards in spite of the loss of their ships. The subcommittee does not believe that because of the loss of their ships the commanding officers are necessarily ineligible for reward, but it does believe that in each such case these officers are on the defensive, and instead of the loss of their ships being taken as an opportunity where an award may be given, it is an obstacle, though not necessarily an insurmountable obstacle, in the way of an award. In all such cases of the loss of a ship, before an award should be given, the commanding officer should have rendered at least as high, if not a higher, degree of distinguished service or of heroism as in the cases of other officers who had not lost their ships.

The subcommittee does not believe that the Secretary of the Navy intended to award medals to commanding officers of ships which were lost in the war merely because their ships were lost, but it does believe that the Secretary did not require of these men a sufficient degree of distinguished service or of heroism to warrant the awards given them in some of the cases contained in his report for the year 1919, and it further believes that the Secretary has been more zealous in furthering the interests of commanders who have lost their ships than of other commanders who, instead of losing their ships, have destroyed or damaged the ships of the enemy.

The subcommittee is therefore firmly of the opinion that the policy laid down by the Secretary of the Navy in regard to awards to commanders who have lost their ships, in his letters of December 19 and January 13, will be detrimental to the United States Navy.

The subcommittee believes that it is not advisable to repeal the statute providing for awards in the Navy nor to amend it as far as relates to awards for services rendered during the late war, but it recommends that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate ask the Secretary of the Navy to ap-

point a board of officers of the Navy to consider the question of recommending changes in the statute for future awards.

The subcommittee further believes that in making final awards under the present statute in view of the fact that it would not be feasible in the present instance to follow the policy in regard to relative merits outlined by it, the best interests of the Navy will be consulted by the Secretary of the Navy if he follows the recommendations of the board of awards which is now in session and which as the Secretary of the Navy himself has said will consider not only the recommendations and citations of the officers and men of the Navy already in their possession but also the testimony given at the hearings of the subcommittee.

It hopes that the board of awards will be given full discretion to change or to continue any of its former recommendations according to the latest evidence which shall be in its hands and that the board will not be bound by the findings published in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for the year 1919.

It further hopes that the board will give especial attention to deserving cases among the enlisted men of the Navy and of the merchant marine who may be eligible under the statute. In many instances owing to the lack of explicitness in the statute as to its application to the enlisted men of the Navy and also to the length of time that had elapsed between the armistice and the making of the recommendations by the commanding officers and the consequent inaccessibility of the records the services of the enlisted men of the Navy have not received the recognition which they undoubtedly deserve.

FREDERICK HALE,  
MEDILL MCCORMICK,  
MILES POINDEXTER.

REPORT BY KEY PITTMAN, MEMBER OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, APPOINTED JANUARY 6 TO INVESTIGATE NAVAL AWARDS.

On the 4th day of February, 1919, the Congress of the United States passed an act entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished service medals, Navy crosses, and for other purposes."

All medals, crosses, and honors, under the act, are to be presented by the President of the United States.

The distinguished service medal is to be granted "to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished, or who hereafter shall distinguish, himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility."

The Navy cross is to be presented "to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished, or who shall hereafter distinguish, himself by extraordinary heroism or distinguished service in the line of his profession, such heroism or service not being sufficient to justify the award of a medal of honor or a distinguished service medal."

The medal of honor is presented "to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, shall, in action involving actual conflict with the enemy, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry or intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command or the command to which attached."

It is usual to award and present such honors at the time the services are performed that entitle a person to them. The act, however, did not become a law until after the signing of the armistice. The Secretary, therefore, on the 18th day of January, 1919, caused an order to be issued to each of the commanders of naval forces directing that each of them immediately forward to the Navy Department a specific statement or report distinctly setting forth the act or distinguished service performed by any person while in the naval service entitling him to any one of the honors mentioned, and that in such report he make suggestions or recommendations for the proper official recognition.

On the 6th day of March, 1919, the Secretary of the Navy constituted and convened a naval board of awards to examine and consider the statements and reports concerning persons recommended for official recognition under the act. This board was further authorized to make suggestions to the Secretary with regard to the approval, modification, or disapproval of the recommendations of commanding officers with regard to such awards. This board was known as the Knight Board, and was composed of a number of high naval officers, with Admiral Austin M. Knight, Admiral Charles J. Badger, and Admiral De Witt Coffman at the head of such board.

This board on the 23d day of September, 1919, made its report with regard to about 4,000 recommendations for official recognition under the act. The board, in many cases, disapproved of



the recommendations made by commanding officers. It may, however, be said in justice to such commanding officers that such disapproval, in most cases, was the result of a difference of opinion as to the degree of official recognition that should be given to the person recommended. For instance, in some cases where the commanding officer recommended a medal of honor the board changed the recommendation to a distinguished service medal or a Navy cross, or where the commanding officer recommended a Navy cross the board were of the opinion that the person was entitled to a distinguished service medal.

A careful reading of the provisions of the act above quoted will readily make apparent the difficulty of determining in many cases the award to which a person is entitled and accounts for the natural difference of opinion. It will be remembered that under the act a statement of the acts of the person recommended for official recognition must be contained in the report of recommendation. It was the duty of the board to carefully examine each of these statements of fact and upon such examination to determine whether the person recommended was entitled to a medal of honor or a distinguished service medal or a Navy cross or no recognition at all. No two of these cases were alike, and in many the classification was exceedingly difficult.

The Secretary of the Navy received the report of the board and made a careful examination of the statements of fact and recommendations in each case. On the 1st day of December, 1919, he filed a tentative report of recommendations for naval awards. In most cases the Secretary of the Navy, in his report, approved the action of the board. In some cases, however, he increased the reward of honor, while in others he decreased it. His action was based upon a difference of opinion as to the proper classification under the statements and reports submitted by the commanding officers with their recommendations.

Subsequent to the filing of the report by the Knight Board detailed statements, reports, and recommendations with regard to persons entitled to official recognition were received at the Navy Department. Additional evidence also came to the knowledge of the Secretary with regard to recommendations that had already been tentatively passed upon by him. In view of these circumstances, on the 5th day of January, 1920, he reconvened the Knight Board and rereferred to it not only the new cases that had come to his notice, but all of the recommendations theretofore made by commanding officers, by the board, and by himself, with full authority to take such further or different action as the board saw fit.

On the 17th day of December, 1919, Admiral Sims publicly charged that the morale of the Navy had been seriously affected by gross injustices done in the matter of such awards.

On the 6th day of January, 1920, the matter was brought to the attention of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, and at the same time it was brought to the attention of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. The Naval Affairs Committee of the House declined to take any action with regard to such charges made by Admiral Sims. The Senate Committee was notified by the Secretary of the Navy that he had reconvened the Knight Board for the purpose of further investigation, action, and report with regard to all recommendations for awards. A motion was then made "that a subcommittee of five be appointed by the Chair to investigate the subject of the awarding of medals in the naval service, said committee to communicate with the House Naval Affairs Committee and ask them to join in this investigation." A substitute motion was then offered that the investigation be postponed until after the further report by the Knight Board, which was then in session. The substitute motion was lost and the original motion was carried.

On the 16th day of January, 1920, the subcommittee proceeded with the hearings, and Admiral Sims took the witness stand. In discussing the changes made by the board and by the Secretary of the Navy of the awards recommended by him it was called to his attention that the board in the great majority of the cases submitted had approved the recommendations of the commanding officers and that the Secretary of the Navy had also in the great majority of the cases approved the recommendations made by the commanding officers. To this Admiral Sims replied, and I quote his exact language: "It is not the number of cases but only the half dozen which are doing the damage."

Let us then consider these half dozen cases.

The first case of alleged injustice cited by the admiral was the action with regard to Commander J. V. Babcock. The admiral describes Commander Babcock in this language:

This officer accompanied me to Europe in 1917; remained attached to my staff, returning to the United States in October, 1919; an officer of very unusual ability and possessed to a very unusual degree professional attainment. His assistance was invaluable to me. I con-

sider that his services during the war were exceptionally brilliant and meritorious, and that he reflected the greatest possible credit upon the naval service.

Admiral Sims recommended Commander Babcock and 18 other members of his staff for distinguished service medals. These recommendations, together with all others, were referred to the Knight Board. The board approved of 6 of the admiral's recommendations for distinguished service medals, but as to the other 13 recommendations, it recommended the award of the Navy cross instead of the distinguished service medal. Commander Babcock was in this latter class. The board declined to approve Admiral Sims's recommendation that Commander Babcock be awarded the distinguished service medal, but recommended that he be given the Navy cross. The Secretary of the Navy approved the recommendation of the Knight Board in the matter with regard to the award to be given to Commander Babcock.

This illustrates the difference of opinion even among naval officers as to the grade of honor called for by particular services. It does not seem possible that such action by a great naval board could destroy the morale of such a Navy as we possess.

The admiral then cited the cases of Lieut. A. L. Gates, Ensign C. H. Hamman, Ensign G. H. Ludlow, and Capt. H. I. Cone.

According to the official record, Lieut. Gates was recommended by Admiral Sims for the congressional medal of honor. The board declined to approve the recommendation, and instead recommended the award of a distinguished service medal. The Secretary of the Navy adopted the recommendation of the board.

Ensign Hamman was recommended by Admiral Sims for the congressional medal of honor. The board declined to approve the recommendation, and instead recommended the award of a Navy cross. The Secretary of the Navy adopted the recommendation of the board.

Ensign Ludlow was recommended by Admiral Sims for a distinguished service medal. The board declined to approve of the recommendation, and instead recommended the award of a Navy cross. The Secretary of the Navy adopted the recommendation of the board.

Capt. Cone was recommended by Admiral Sims for a distinguished service medal. The recommendation was approved by the board. The Secretary of the Navy declined to accept the recommendation, and instead approved the award of a Navy cross.

There does not appear to be the slightest probability that such action by the Navy Department could in the slightest degree injure the morale of the Navy. In each and all of these cases the meritorious services of these junior officers were recognized and rewarded with a high honor. They were simply cases illustrating the natural difference of opinion even between high naval officers as to the character of honor a particular service calls for.

There was one other case that Admiral Sims called particular attention to and dwelt upon at length in his effort to sustain the charge that flagrant injustice in the half dozen cases was destroying the morale of the Navy. This was the case of Commander D. W. Bagley. The official report of this case is as follows:

The U. S. destroyer *Jacob Jones*, under Commander D. W. Bagley, U. S. N., was at 4.21 p. m., December 6, 1917, sunk by a torpedo from an enemy submarine about 30 miles south of the Scilly Isles, in the English Channel, the ship sinking about 8 minutes after being struck. The report states that the destroyer was under way and steering zig-zag courses at this time. The first evidence of the presence of the submarine was the sight of a torpedo about 1,000 yards distant and heading for the starboard beam of the ship and running at high speed of about 40 knots. Prompt action was taken to avoid the torpedo, without success. The ship settled rapidly by the stern and the aft end of the ship was quickly submerged. The depth charges exploded just as the stern sank.

Every effort was made to launch the boats and raft, but considerable difficulty was encountered, caused by the wreckage due to the explosion. There was a total of 7 officers and 103 men on board, and 2 officers and 64 men lost their lives. The commanding officer, who was in the chart house, ordered every man to leave the ship and to jump clear, as it was sinking. He jumped overboard as the ship sank. The ship sank stern first and twisted slowly through nearly 180 degrees as she swung upright, and with the bow in the air in nearly a vertical position she went straight down. The report states that the explosion of the depth charges caused the death of a number of men and partially paralyzed and stunned a number of others, including Lieut. Kalk, Commander Bagley, and a number of men. A number of the boats were also destroyed by the explosion, which seriously interfered in the rescuing of the men. Lieut. S. F. Kalk lost his life from exposure as a result of his heroic work in swimming from one raft to another in an effort to equalize the weight on the rafts. In recognition of the heroic conduct of Lieut. Kalk a torpedo-boat destroyer has been named for him, and he was selected for a distinguished service medal.

After being picked up by one of the boats Commander Bagley made an immediate effort to get all the survivors on the rafts and remaining boats. He then set out to row to the Scilly Islands, a distance of about 30 miles, in an endeavor to obtain assistance, but the boat was picked up by a small patrol vessel about 1 p. m. the next day, Decem-



ber 7, about 6 miles south of St. Marys Island, where he was informed that the other survivors had been rescued the night before. Many instances of heroic conduct by various officers and men of the ship are recorded. The radio instruments were so damaged by the explosion as to prevent sending the S O S signal.

The following extract from the testimony of Lieut. Norman Scott, United States Navy, executive officer and navigator of the *Jacob Jones*, is quoted:

"Q. State all you know concerning the loss of the *Jacob Jones* on December 6, 1917, which was not covered in the report of commanding officer, or may be at variance therewith.—A. Nothing; except I would like to call attention to the behavior of my commanding officer, Lieut. Commander David W. Bagley, at that time. He was partly stunned by the explosion of the depth charges, and when picked up was practically unconscious; but in spite of this, and realizing our desperate situation in not having sent out an S O S, he began to make arrangements to get assistance, and his actions while in charge of the men on this trip I consider remarkable. The condition of the weather at this time and the lack of equipment in the boat made navigation extremely difficult, and it was at Capt. Bagley's direction that we steered by the direction of the sea, and, as we found out next day, the course proved to be correct. In spite of his stunned condition throughout the entire trip, he was cheering up the men, two of whom were very low in vitality and spirit. At the time of the appearance of the submarine on the surface Capt. Bagley started to go to the submarine to give himself up, with the hope of getting assistance through the submarine for the surviving members of the crew. He told me at the time that he would rather die than do that. The submarine, however, disappeared before he could reach it."

The following is quoted from the finding of the court of inquiry: "That the commanding officer, officers, and men of the U. S. S. *Jacob Jones* bore themselves in accordance with the best traditions of the service. The court is of the opinion that the loss of the U. S. S. *Jacob Jones* was one of the hazards of war, and that no blame or responsibility attaches to any officer or man of the U. S. S. *Jacob Jones* in connection therewith."

On December 26, 1917, Admiral Sims approved the findings, opinion, and recommendation of the court, and writing, in his own hand, in London, under date of January 8, 1918, Admiral Sims said:

"Bagley's handling of the situation after his ship was torpedoed was everything I expected in the way of efficiency, good judgment, courage, and chivalrous action."

Admiral Sims, testifying with regard to the torpedoing of the *Jacob Jones*, said:

Just why the *Jacob Jones* was attacked, we only know from a report that has been given out since by Hans Rose, who was the man who attacked her (the same one who came over to Newport with the *U-53*), that he just took a chance shot at her from a distance of 2 miles, with probably one chance in a thousand of hitting her; but he did hit her.

Admiral Sims recommended Commander Bagley for the Navy cross. The board approved the award. The Secretary of the Navy recommended the award of a distinguished service medal.

There were several similar cases in which commanding officers had recommended the granting of distinguished service medals to officers who had lost their ships under similar circumstances, and such awards had been approved by the board. It became necessary therefore for the Secretary of the Navy to either reduce the award to such officers to a Navy cross or raise the award of all other officers who performed similar meritorious services under similar circumstances to that of a distinguished service medal. He raised all to distinguished service medals. The following are some of the similar cases in which distinguished service medals had been recommended and approved by the board:

The U. S. destroyer *Cassin*, under Commander W. N. Vernou, U. S. N., on October 15, 1917, was patrolling off the south coast of Ireland. At 1.30 p. m. a submarine was sighted and the destroyer headed for the submarine, which submerged and disappeared. About 30 minutes later a torpedo was seen coming toward the *Cassin* at high speed and about 400 yards distant. The *Cassin* was maneuvered to avoid the torpedo without success, and the ship was struck on her port side. The ship was kept afloat and towed into port by the British destroyer *Tamarisk*, which was fortunately in the neighborhood.

Admiral Sims recommended Commander Vernou for a Navy cross. The naval board declined to approve the recommendation and instead recommended the award of a distinguished service medal.

The U. S. naval transport *President Lincoln*, under command of Commander Percy W. Foote, U. S. N., was sunk at about 9 a. m., on May 31, 1918, when about 500 miles off Brest, France, on making her return voyage to America. The *President Lincoln* was struck by three torpedoes fired almost simultaneously from a German submarine, which it was afterwards learned was the *U-96*. Two torpedoes struck the ship in about the same place, the port side of the ship, and the third torpedo struck in the afterpart of the ship. The ship sank in about 30 minutes after being struck, and 23 men and 3 officers lost their lives.

The finding of the court of inquiry was as follows:

The court is of the opinion that the conduct of all officers and men of the U. S. S. *President Lincoln* and of the U. S. destroyers *Warrington* and *Smith* has reflected credit on the United States Navy.

The action of the court was approved by Rear Admiral Wilson, commander of the naval forces in France.

On June 3, Admiral Sims cabled the department reporting the circumstances attending the sinking of the *President Lincoln* and stated that "small loss of life is due to thorough discipline, ship's company, and excellent seamanship, Commander Foote."

Admiral Gleaves recommended Commander Foote for the distinguished service medal as follows: "It is recommended that

Commander Percy W. Foote, United States Navy, be awarded the distinguished service medal for exceptionally meritorious service with the Government in a duty of great responsibility at the time of the torpedoing of the U. S. S. *President Lincoln*. Commander Foote's conduct on this occasion measured up to the best traditions of the service."

Admiral Mayo, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, approved the above recommendation as follows:

Forwarded. The commander in chief recommends that a distinguished service medal be awarded to Commander Percy W. Foote.

The U. S. S. *San Diego*, armored cruiser, under command of Commander H. H. Christy, United States Navy, at about 11.05 a. m., July 19, 1918, struck a mine when approaching the harbor of New York, south of Long Island. The records of the court of inquiry show that as a result of this explosion the ship finally rolled over and sank, bottom up, at 11.25 a. m., July 19, 1918, 20 minutes after striking the mine.

The court of inquiry found that—

at the time of the disaster and thereafter the conduct of the captain, officers, and crew was in the highest degree commendable, and that the remarkably small loss of life was due to the high state of discipline maintained on board.

Admiral Gleaves recommended Capt. H. H. Christy for the distinguished service medal. The recommendation was approved by Admiral Mayo and by the board of awards. The Secretary of the Navy followed such recommendations.

The U. S. S. *Mount Vernon*, Navy transport, under command of Capt. D. E. Dismukes, United States Navy, was on the morning of September 26, 1918, struck by a torpedo from an enemy submarine. \* \* \* Through the skill and good judgment of Capt. Dismukes and the officers in command of his ship, he was able to bring the *Mount Vernon* into port at Brest.

Admiral Gleaves recommended the award of a distinguished service medal to Capt. Dismukes. The recommendation was approved by Admiral Mayo. The board of awards recommended the distinguished service medal, and the recommendation was followed by the Secretary of the Navy.

The U. S. S. *Tampa*, Coast Guard cutter, under command of Capt. C. A. Satterlee, U. S. C. G., was sunk in the Bristol Channel, off the English coast, at about 8.45 p. m., on September 26, 1918. All on board were lost.

Rear Admiral Niblack, who was the commander of the patrol squadron based on Gibraltar, recommended that the distinguished service medal be awarded to Capt. Satterlee. The board of awards did not approve the recommendation, and instead recommended the Navy cross for Capt. Satterlee. The Secretary of the Navy disapproved of the recommendation of the naval board, approved of the recommendation of Admiral Niblack, and recommended the distinguished service medal.

The U. S. S. *Minnesota*, battleship, under command of Capt. J. V. Chase, United States Navy, struck a mine at 3.15 a. m., September 29, 1918, about 20 miles from Fenwick Island Shoal, on the United States Atlantic coast. She did not sink, however, and proceeded to port and arrived inside of Delaware Bay at 9.30 p. m., December 29.

The board of inquiry made the following finding:

The board is of the opinion that officers and crew deserve the highest praise for the manner in which the ship was handled after the explosion, for maintaining order, for localizing the injury to the ship, and for successfully navigating her into port.

Admiral Gleaves recommended that Capt. Chase be awarded the distinguished service medal. The recommendation was approved by Admiral Mayo; the board of awards recommended the distinguished service medal, and the recommendation was approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

The U. S. S. *Alcedo*, converted naval yacht, under command of Commander W. T. Conn, Jr., United States Navy, while acting as escort to a convoy at 1.45 a. m., November 5, 1917, was struck by an enemy torpedo and sank in eight minutes.

Admiral Sims recommended the award of a Navy cross to Commander Conn. The board approved the recommendation. The Secretary of the Navy recommended the distinguished service medal in this statement:

His performance of duty on the *Alcedo*, the manner in which he remained at his post and sank with his ship, and his work in connection with the rescuing of the survivors was in keeping with the highest traditions of the service, and I directed that he be awarded a distinguished service medal.

The U. S. Army transport *Finland*, Capt. S. V. Graham, United States Navy, in command of naval armed guard on board, was struck by enemy torpedo at about 9.25 a. m., October 28, 1917, about 150 miles off the French coast. The ship was badly damaged, but was taken into port.

The court of inquiry found that "due to the prompt and efficient efforts of Capt. S. V. Graham, United States Navy, and Master Jensen, and Asst. Engineer Nikkelsen order was restored and the vessel enabled to returned to port."

Admiral Gleaves recommended Capt. Graham for a distinguished service medal. The recommendation was approved by Admiral Mayo, the Navy Board, and the Secretary of the Navy.

The U. S. Army transport *Antilles*, with Commander D. T. Ghent, United States Navy, in command of the Navy armed guard on board, was sunk on October 17, 1917, about 300 miles off the coast of France when making the return voyage to America.

Admiral Sims stated that "conduct of the members of the armed guard was a credit to the service, and the senior naval



officer on the *Antilles* (Commander Ghent) carried out his duties efficiently."

As at that time the naval armed guards were not under any naval force commander, no recommendations were made. The Secretary of the Navy recommended the award of the distinguished service medal to Commander Ghent.

A comparison of the findings of the court of inquiry and the reports of the commanding officers in these various cases where the distinguished service medal was recommended with the findings of the court of inquiry and the reports in the case of Commander D. W. Bagley will, I believe, convince any unprejudiced mind that Bagley's case was similar to the others and that he was entitled to the same treatment as those officers who were recommended for distinguished service medals.

Admiral Sims in the letter that he addressed to the Secretary of the Navy under date of November 12, 1919, says: "In the case of destroyers or other vessels that were successfully attacked by German submarines, no special distinctions were recommended."

The foregoing cases that have just been cited completely contradict Admiral Sims' statement.

The commander of the *San Diego* lost his ship, but he was recommended by his commanding officers and by the board for the distinguished service medal.

The commander of the *President Lincoln* lost his ship, but he was recommended by his commanding officers and by the board for the award of the distinguished service medal.

Capt. Satterlee lost his ship, but his commanding officers recommended him for the distinguished service medal and the Secretary of the Navy approved the recommendation.

Admiral Sims, in his letter to the Secretary of the Navy, referred to, says:

By reason of the peculiar nature of the submarine warfare, no blame attaches to the commanding officers of these vessels for their failure, but on no account should they receive a special reward for this lack of success.

Admiral Mayo, Admiral Gleaves, Admiral Wilson, and Admiral Niblack apparently did not hold the same views with regard to such matters, as each and all of them recommended for distinguished service medals commanding officers who were not successful when attacked by submarines and who lost their ships.

Admiral Sims did recommend a special reward to Commander D. W. Bagley. He recommended the award of a Navy cross. This is but a slightly lesser honor than a distinguished service medal. Is it possible that Admiral Sims does believe that the granting of a distinguished service medal to Bagley, under the circumstances, instead of the Navy cross that he recommended, can destroy the morale of the Navy?

Admiral Sims testified that it was the policy of the British Navy not to give an officer who lost his ship another command, even though the ship was lost through no fault of the officer. He approved such policy. It is apparent that Admiral Sims has been deeply impressed with British policies and practices. In fact, his constant reference in his testimony to the Victoria Cross and other matters purely British would lead a civilian to the conclusion that possibly Admiral Sims is more familiar with British ideas, customs, and manners than with those of his own country.

The admiral made this indorsement upon the back of a list that was submitted to him for recommendation for awards: "The line of demarcation between the distinguished service medal and the Navy cross is not clear to me \* \* \*." And then after quoting this indorsement the admiral testified: "You see, we had to guess at what these meant."

The Secretary of the Navy furnished Admiral Sims with the act describing the different medals, and yet he seemed incapable of interpreting the statute. I quote from the testimony:

Senator PITTMAN. Admiral, I have not had time to look over this list, but how many enlisted men did you recommend for a medal, or honor, or distinguished service recognition?

Admiral SIMS. We had no opportunity to, because they balled this thing up so badly in the law that we have not got the graded medals to give them. What they should have had is a minimum. There were three different grades, classes of medals for distinguished service and three different grades for heroism, the Victoria Cross and two other ones below, so we could do that.

Senator PITTMAN. Do you mean to say that you have no knowledge of any enlisted man participating in services such as these officers have performed?

Admiral SIMS. We have such cases in which we would be allowed to give them something less than the Victoria Cross, something less than the citations, but we had nothing to give them at all.

Senator PITTMAN. Even though they performed the actions that certain officers performed?

Admiral SIMS. Yes.

Senator PITTMAN. Were they not entitled to exactly the same medals as officers?

Admiral SIMS. That is what they do in the Croix de Guerre and the Victoria Cross. All the rest of the Governments give them.

Admiral Sims did not recommend a single enlisted man for a distinguished service medal. As throwing some light upon the policy which Admiral Sims adopted in making up his list for recommendation for the award of various honors and as a justification of the board and of the Secretary of the Navy in refusing to approve of many of the admiral's recommendations, I quote the following from the testimony of Admiral Sims:

Moreover, if I hear that this man here has sent in a great many recommendations for distinguished service medals, more than I would think it was proper to send in, I would not like to send in less, for fear of injuring the morale of my command; but I would send in as many, in the hope that the board of awards would scale them all down parallel.

In view of such statement Admiral Sims should not even be surprised that the naval board only approved 28 out of 75 of the recommendations made by him for distinguished service medals. His opinion of the naval board, composed of some of the most distinguished admirals in our Navy, is aptly disclosed by the following colloquy during the testimony:

Senator PITTMAN. Would it not be rather strange if you did recommend these men for the highest honor that the board would cut them down to the lowest grade?

Admiral SIMS. It would be strange; so it is.

Senator PITTMAN. But you have every confidence in that board, have you not?

Admiral SIMS. I have not.

From the foregoing statement of facts, and a careful review of all of the evidence, I am forced to the following conclusions:

#### CONCLUSIONS.

1. That the investigation by the subcommittee was entirely unnecessary, because at the time of the appointment of the committee the entire matter, by direction of the Secretary of the Navy, was being reinvestigated by the Knight Board of Awards.

2. The investigation, like most congressional investigations of this character, has served no beneficial purpose, but, on the contrary, in my opinion, through the airing of the personal grievances of an admiral and in giving publicity to critical and deprecatory statements made by the admiral with regard to the accomplishment of the American Navy during the Great War, has tended to besmirch a glory that was never before questioned.

3. The policy with regard to the awarding of the medals was laid down by Congress in the act and could not be changed by the Secretary of the Navy, or any commanding officer, or anyone else. The Secretary of the Navy pursued the only practical policy in sending each commanding officer a copy of the act, with directions that he not only make recommendations but that he send in a statement and report of the facts justifying the recommendation in each case, and then submitting all of such recommendations and the accompanying statements and reports to a naval board composed of high naval officers.

4. That Admiral Sims is sincerely convinced that no naval board is competent to review and act upon any recommendation made by him; that the changing in the slightest degree of any award to any officer made by him is so grave an error that it would be better that no medals be awarded at all; that he believes that the awarding of the distinguished service medal should be limited to a few of the highest officers in the Navy, and that it has been cheapened by being awarded to so many junior officers and enlisted men.

5. That the whole dispute has developed into a tempest in a teapot and is too ridiculous to be mentioned in connection with the morale of a fighting Navy.

6. That the expressed determination of the Secretary of the Navy to hold open the matter of permanent awards until reports concerning enlisted men and fuller reports concerning officers can be obtained, considered, and acted upon by the Naval Board is the proper policy to be pursued.

KEY PITTMAN,

Member of the Subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate on Naval Awards.

REPORT BY PARK TRAMMELL, MEMBER OF SUBCOMMITTEE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 5, 1920.

On January 6, 1920, your committee adopted a resolution providing as follows, to wit:

That a subcommittee of five be appointed by the Chair to investigate the subject of the awarding of medals in the naval service.

In conformity with the said resolution you named the members of the said subcommittee, and the subcommittee so designated has conducted and concluded the investigation which it was authorized and directed to make.

As a member of this subcommittee, I desire to submit to you the following report, to wit:

The inquiry and investigation, in the main, was upon the following subjects:

First. The method and system which governs in awarding special decorations in the naval service.



Second. The official action and records of the Secretary of the Navy and various naval officers in making awards of medals.

Third. Whether or not any decoration was awarded to any officer or officers on account of the loss of a ship.

Fourth. The effect upon the morale of the Navy as a result of the manner in which the awarding of medals has been conducted.

The law governing the award of medals was approved February 4, 1919. By this statute there is provided:

First. A medal of honor.

Second. A distinguished service medal.

Third. A Navy cross.

The medal of honor is to be awarded to—

A person who, while in the naval service of the United States, shall, in action involving actual conflict with the enemy, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command or the command to which attached.

The distinguished service medal is to be awarded to—

A person who, while in the naval service of the United States, since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished or who hereafter shall distinguish himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility.

The Navy cross is to be awarded to—

A person, who while in the naval service of the United States since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished or who shall hereafter distinguish himself by extraordinary heroism or distinguished service in the line of his profession, such heroism or service not being sufficient to justify the award of a medal of honor or a distinguished service medal.

The statute governing this subject does not provide in detail the system to be adopted in its execution. The manner of the administration of the law therefore rests with the Navy Department, restricted only by the expressed provisions of the law.

The testimony discloses that the first action looking to a special decoration of an officer or an enlisted man was for his naval superior to make a statement or report setting forth the act and distinguishing service, and suggesting or recommending official recognition thereof, which said report was made through official channels. The superior officer to the officer who initiated the report and suggestion exercised the right to either approve or disapprove the recommendation made by his subordinate officer. This discretion seems to have prevailed with all officers who had to consider the original statement and suggestion that special recognition should be given to a specific officer or enlisted man.

As an illustration, a commanding officer may set forth facts which in his opinion entitled a particular person to a distinguished service medal and recommend the award of the same. His superior officer who in official channels next considers the report and recommendation may disapprove of the award of a distinguished service medal and recommend a Navy cross, or may disapprove of awarding any special recognition in the case.

This policy of exercising the discretion to disapprove or recommend a modification of the initial suggestion or recommendation seems to have prevailed with all officers who had jurisdiction over the subject of the award of special decorations.

As might have been expected, the testimony discloses that in a number of cases there was a conflict of opinion on the part of the officers who passed upon the question of whether or not the case under consideration was one in which an award should be made, and, if made, the character of the medal that should be awarded. This divergence of opinion prevailed between many of the naval officers, as well as between a number of the naval officers and the Secretary of the Navy. Each officer and the Secretary of the Navy appear from the testimony to have acted in accordance with their own judgment after giving consideration to the facts and the recommendations in the particular case being passed upon. This general policy prevailed throughout the Navy, without an exception, as far as disclosed by the testimony.

The hearing developed the fact that there was more or less conflict of opinion on the part of some of the naval officers as to the degree of recognition which should be given to the members of the staff of certain officials ashore as in contrast with officers who were serving at sea.

Admiral Sims, whose complaint brought about the investigation, took the position that 19 officers upon his staff should be awarded the distinguished service medal, and that 13 should be awarded the Navy cross; and, while he requested this special recognition for 32 members of his staff, he took the position that a number of officers who were serving at sea in the war zone should not have been awarded the distinguished service medal.

On the other hand, Admirals Mayo and Gleaves and the board of awards had recommended the award of the distinguished service medal to several of these particular officers at sea about

which Admiral Sims made complaint. Admirals Mayo and Gleaves were commanding at sea, and Admiral Sims was in London most of the time performing his duties and did not command at sea during the war.

It appears from the hearing that each of the naval officers and the Secretary of the Navy acted within the authority vested in them under the regulations and the law in making recommendations for the award of special decorations. In each case, however, the final decision rested with the Secretary of the Navy, and he acted within the law when he made any changes in the recommendations which had been made to him by his subordinates.

The board of awards was not a statutory board but a board which was created by the Secretary of the Navy to pass upon all cases and make its recommendations to the Secretary for his final consideration.

It does not seem to have been the custom for any of the naval officers or the board of awards to advise with their subordinates when they proposed to disapprove or make a change in the recommendations which had been made to them by subordinate officers. The Secretary, therefore, when he failed to confer with Admiral Sims relative to the changes he proposed to make in the recommendations which had been made to him by Admiral Sims was acting within the policy which seems to have been followed by Admiral Sims and all other naval officers and the board of awards. Under these circumstances and the practice and custom which prevailed throughout the Navy in dealing with the award of special decoration I do not share in the criticism of the Secretary of the Navy by Admiral Sims on account of him having exercised his own discretion and judgment upon the subject. To say that he was in error in exercising his own judgment and discretion would be to also condemn Admirals Sims, Mayo, Gleaves, Grant, and Niblack, the board of awards, and all other naval officers who have made recommendations, because they, too, exercised their own judgment and discretion and in a number of instances disapproved or modified the recommendations which had been submitted to them for consideration.

The testimony disclosing, as it did, that such a large number of officers had been recommended for special decoration, and so few enlisted men had been recommended, I am impressed that those whose duty it was to initiate citations and recommendations were recreant in the performance of their duty in so far as the enlisted men are concerned. The same vigilance should have been exercised in ascertaining the enlisted men who were entitled to distinction as was exercised in regard to the officers. I am impressed from the testimony that this was not true.

One of the subjects inquired into by your committee was as to whether or not any officer had been awarded a medal on account of the loss of or the serious damage to his ship while in combat with the enemy, and as to whether or not the Secretary of the Navy had made an award to any officer for such reason. The testimony developed the fact that neither the Secretary of the Navy nor any naval officer had awarded or recommended the award of a medal on account of great damage to a ship or the loss of a ship when in combat with the enemy. The hearing developed that certain officers who were commanders of ships that were badly damaged or lost were recommended for the award of special decoration, but the testimony shows that such recommendations and awards were not based upon the fact that the ship had been damaged or lost. Because an officer's ship suffered loss or damage was not, however, held by the Secretary of the Navy, the board of awards, Admiral Sims, Admiral Mayo, Admiral Gleaves, and other officers of the Navy to be a reason for precluding an officer from a recommendation for and the award of a medal.

Each of the admirals referred to, the board of awards, and the Secretary of the Navy did in certain cases recommend the award of special decoration to certain officers who had come in contact with the enemy and were so unfortunate as to have their ships either badly damaged or sunk. Some of these officers recommended the Navy cross, while others recommended the distinguished service medal. Their action in making recommendations in such cases establishes the fact that none of the naval officers nor the Secretary of the Navy entertained the opinion that an officer should be excluded from special recognition because his ship had been damaged or lost on account of the blow of the enemy. There seems to be no difference of opinion, judging from the recommendations which were made, between the naval officers and the Secretary of the Navy regarding this main question.

The difference is only one as to the degree of the special recognition to the officer whose record, conduct, bravery, and resourcefulness, considered as a whole, may entitle him to a medal. As illustrating the fact that the damage or loss of a ship was not held to preclude an officer from the award of a medal, I desire



to bring to the attention of the committee the following cases, to wit:

Capt. S. V. Graham, whose ship, the U. S. Army transport *Finland*, was badly damaged by the enemy, was recommended by Admirals Mayo and Gleaves of the board of awards for a distinguished service medal, and was awarded such medal by the Secretary of the Navy.

Commander Percy W. Foote, of the U. S. naval transport *President Lincoln*, whose ship was sunk by the enemy's attack, was recommended for the distinguished service medal by Admiral Gleaves, Admiral Mayo, and the board of awards, and such medal was awarded to him by the Secretary of the Navy.

Capt. H. H. Christy, of the U. S. S. *San Diego*, whose ship was sunk by a mine, was recommended for a distinguished service medal by Admiral Gleaves, Admiral Mayo, and the board of awards, and such medal was awarded to him by the Secretary of the Navy.

Capt. D. E. Dismukes, of the U. S. S. *Mount Vernon*, Navy transport, had his ship struck by a torpedo from an enemy submarine and badly damaged. He was recommended by Admiral Gleaves, Admiral Mayo, and the board of awards for a distinguished service medal, and these recommendations were approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

Capt. J. V. Chase, of the U. S. S. *Minnesota*, battleship, whose ship was struck by a mine and badly damaged, was recommended by Admiral Gleaves, Admiral Mayo, and the board of awards for a distinguished service medal. Their recommendation was approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

Capt. C. A. Satterlee, of the U. S. S. *Tampa*, whose ship was sunk and all on board lost, was recommended by Admiral Niblack for a distinguished service medal and by the board of awards for a Navy cross, and the Secretary of the Navy awarded him a distinguished service medal.

Commander W. N. Vernou, whose ship, the U. S. destroyer *Cassin*, was badly damaged by the enemy, was recommended by Admiral Sims for a Navy cross and by the board of awards for the distinguished service medal, and the board's recommendation was approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

Commander W. T. Conn, jr., whose ship, the U. S. S. *Alcedo*, converted naval yacht, was struck by the enemy and sank in eight minutes, was recommended by Admiral Sims and the board of awards for a Navy cross and was awarded a distinguished service medal by the Secretary of the Navy.

Commander D. W. Bagley, whose ship, the U. S. destroyer *Jacob Jones*, was sunk by a torpedo from an enemy submarine, was recommended by Admiral Sims and the board of awards for a Navy cross, and was awarded a distinguished service medal by the Secretary of the Navy.

Commander D. T. Ghent, of the U. S. Army transport *Antilles*, whose ship was sunk by the enemy, was awarded a distinguished service medal by the Secretary of the Navy. His case was investigated at first hand by the Secretary of the Navy, and none of the subordinates to the Secretary considered or passed upon the same.

This covers the record of the officers who were recommended for some form of decoration, even though their ships had been badly damaged or lost, there being a total of 10.

The board of awards passed upon 9 out of the 10 cases, and recommended 6 of the officers for distinguished service medals and 3 for the Navy cross. Of the three recommended by the board for the Navy cross, for Capt. C. A. Satterlee, of the U. S. S. *Tampa*, Admiral Niblack recommended a distinguished service medal.

Admiral Gleaves and Admiral Mayo considered 5 out of the 10 cases and recommended a distinguished service medal in each of the 5 cases considered by them.

Three of the 10 cases were passed upon by Admiral Sims, and in each instance he recommended a Navy cross.

No naval officer had under consideration the matter of an award to Commander D. T. Ghent, of the U. S. Army transport *Antilles*.

The Secretary of the Navy awarded a distinguished service medal to each of the 10 officers who commanded these ships that were either badly damaged or lost. This record clearly establishes the fact that in considering the entire 10 cases in question no naval officer nor the board of awards saw proper to exclude an officer from special decoration on account of his misfortune to have had his ship badly damaged or lost by a blow from the enemy.

The testimony further discloses that the fact that an officer's ship was badly damaged or lost was not the reason why he was recommended for a medal by those making such recommendations, and that he was not for this reason awarded a medal by the Secretary of the Navy.

As to the effect upon the morale of the Navy as a result of the manner in which the awarding of medals has been conducted, it is my opinion, as far as the testimony discloses, that the morale has not been seriously impaired. Doubtless some individuals have been displeased on account of having their hopes shattered and their pride of opinion wounded, but these are individual cases, and the testimony did not disclose that there is any general dissatisfaction prevailing throughout the Navy.

On account of not having a copy of the printed testimony, I have been unable to cite the different pages upon which the testimony appears in support of the different features of my report.

Respectfully submitted.

PARK TRAMMELL,

Member of the Subcommittee of the Naval Affairs  
Committee of the United States Senate on Naval Awards.

FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 247).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of October 3, 1919, a detailed statement of the character, amount, and estimated cost of the work of the commission which has relation to the foreign commerce of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MEMBER OF POSTAL SALARY COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the authority of section 3 of the act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, approved February 28, 1919, the Chair appoints LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS, a Senator from the State of Colorado and a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate, a member of the commission authorized by that section to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD, late a Senator from the State of Alabama.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3696) to change the time for holding court in Laurinburg, eastern district of North Carolina, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COURT IN LAURINBURG, N. C.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3696) to change the time for holding court in Laurinburg, eastern district of North Carolina, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 98 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911," as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 98. The State of North Carolina is divided into two districts, to be known as the eastern and western districts of North Carolina. The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Beaufort, Bertie, Bladen, Brunswick, Camden, Chatham, Cumberland, Currituck, Craven, Columbus, Chowan, Carteret, Dare, Duplin, Durham, Edgecombe, Franklin, Gates, Granville, Greene, Halifax, Harnett, Hertford, Hyde, Johnston, Jones, Lenoir, Lee, Martin, Moore, Nash, New Hanover, Northampton, Onslow, Pamlico, Pasquotank, Pender, Perquimans, Person, Pitt, Robeson, Richmond, Sampson, Scotland, Tyrrell, Vance, Wake, Warren, Washington, Wayne, and Wilson. Terms of the district court for the eastern district shall be held at Laurinburg on the Monday before the last Mondays in March and September; at Wilson on the first Mondays in April and October; at Elizabeth City on the second Mondays in April and October; at Washington on the third Mondays in April and October; at Newbern on the fourth Mondays in April and October; at Wilmington on the second Monday after the fourth Mondays in April and October; and at Raleigh on the fourth Monday after the fourth Mondays in April and October and, in addition, for the trial of civil cases on the first Mondays in March and September: *Provided*, That the city of Washington, the city of Laurinburg, and the city of Wilson shall each provide and furnish at its own expense a suitable and convenient place for holding the district court at Washington, at Laurinburg, and at Wilson until a courthouse shall be constructed by the United States. The clerk of the court for the eastern district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Raleigh, at Wilmington, at Newbern, at Elizabeth City, at Washington, at Laurinburg, and at Wilson, which shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court.

"The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Alamance, Alexander, Ashe, Alleghany, Anson, Buncombe, Burke, Caswell, Cabarrus, Catawba, Cleveland, Caldwell, Clay, Cherokee, Davidson, Davie, Forsyth, Guilford, Gaston, Graham, Henderson, Haywood, Iredell, Jackson, Lincoln, Montgomery, Mecklenburg, Mitchell, McDowell, Madison, Macon, Orange, Polk, Randolph, Rockingham, Rowan, Rutherford, Stanly, Stokes, Surry, Swain, Transylvania, Union, Wilkes, Watauga, Yadkin, and Yancey. Terms of the district court for the western district shall be held in Greensboro on the first Mondays in June and December; at Statesville on the third Mondays in April and October; at Salisbury on the fourth Mondays in April and October; at Asheville on the first Mondays in May and November; at Charlotte on the first Mondays in April and October; and at Wilkesboro on the fourth Monday in May



and November. The clerk of the court for the western district shall maintain an office in charge of himself or a deputy at Greensboro, at Asheville, at Statesville, and at Wilkesboro, which shall be kept open at all times for the transaction of the business of the court."

SEC. 2. That the act entitled "An act providing for the establishment of two additional terms of the district court for the eastern district of North Carolina at Raleigh, N. C.," approved April 27, 1916, is hereby repealed.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 98 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved March 3, 1911, as amended."

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The amendments were agreed to.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry teachers of the public schools of Newton, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill, providing for a Department of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Union of Washington County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation permitting farmers' organizations for collective bargaining, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Earl Collier Post, No. 1, American Legion, of Olathe, Kans., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Ottawa, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a bonus for ex-service men, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Natoma, Newton, Cimarron, Morrill, Howard, and Robinson, all in the State of Kansas, and of sundry citizens of Lutie, Okla., Lorenzo, Nebr., Booneville, Ark., remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

#### RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to provide for the preservation and maintenance of the records of the Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, reported it with an amendment.

#### COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], I submit two reports from the Committee on Commerce and ask for the immediate consideration of the bills.

From the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12164) to authorize the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River between the towns of Pasco and Kennewick, in the State of Washington, I report it back favorably without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 464) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Charles G. Huber, his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, be, and he or they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, such bridge to extend from the east bank of said river adjacent to the town of Pasco, Wash., at a point not more than 2 miles upstream from the Northern Pacific Railway bridge across said river, to a point on the west bank of said river adjacent to the town of Kennewick, Wash., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### NESTUCCA RIVER BRIDGE, OREG.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12213) authorizing F. R. Beals to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Nestucca River, in Tillamook County, Oreg., and I submit a report (No. 465) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That authority is hereby granted to F. R. Beals and his assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Nestucca River, in Tillamook County, Oreg., connecting the northerly part of lot 1 with the northerly part of lot 10, in section 30, township 4 south, range 10 west, Willamette meridian, in Oregon, and at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### WHEAT POOL.

Mr. SMOOT. In behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] I report back favorably, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate resolution 319, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read. The resolution (S. Res. 319), submitted by Mr. REED on the 2d instant, was read, as follows:

Whereas the Federal grand jury sitting at Spokane, Wash., on February 29 made a report containing certain charges against the United States Grain Corporation and its directors of reported speculations in wheat; and

Whereas an account of such report was on March 1 made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Manufactures be directed to inquire into the reported wheat pool and investigate the United States Grain Corporation, and the dealings, operations, speculations, and manipulations if any there has been of such Grain Corporation, its officers and agents, in wheat and wheat products, and report thereon to the Senate, together with their recommendation of any steps which they may deem it necessary to take in view of the findings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I object to its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The resolution will go to the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4028) to amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 4029) for releasing and quitclaiming all claims of the United States to the west 144 feet of arpent lot 79, old city of Pensacola, Escambia County, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 4030) for releasing and quitclaiming all claims of the United States to lot 319 in the old city of Pensacola, situated on the south side of Garden Street, between Alcaniz and Tarragona Streets; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4032) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States and establishing the bureau of naturalization," approved June 29, 1906, as amended, and section 2 of the act entitled "An act to amend the naturalization laws and to repeal certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States and other laws relating to naturalization, and for other purposes," approved May 9, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4033) to amend subdivision 15, schedule A, of title XI of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4034) granting an increase of pension to George W. Manwell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA (for Mr. McCUMBER):

A bill (S. 4035) regulating the practice of chiropractic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 4036) granting a pension to Mary E. Carter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4037) granting an increase of pension to William L. Ronner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN (by request):

A bill (S. 4039) to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### INTERSTATE SHIPMENTS OF COTTON.

By Mr. RANSDALL:

A bill (S. 4031) to regulate interstate shipments of cotton, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, I ask leave to make a brief statement in regard to the bill.

The bill I introduce provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall establish and enforce preferential rates on shipments of cotton based upon the cubic contents of the bale, and in reaching its decision the commission shall take into con-



sideration the density of the bale, the amount of space it occupies, its uniformity in size, the character of its covering as a safeguard against damage or fire, and any other points that seem fairly to entitle it to favorable discrimination.

The object of the bill is to secure fair treatment for interstate shipments of high-density gin-compressed cotton, both round and square bales.

We follow to-day in the baling and handling of 90 per cent of our great cotton crop, valued last year at \$2,000,000,000, the antiquated and slovenly methods of 60 years ago. No other world product is given the criminally careless treatment which cotton receives in being marketed.

High-density gin compression is the most practical reform, and if universally followed would save more than \$100,000,000 a year.

Ordinary plantation bales weigh 500 pounds, have a density of 12 pounds per cubic foot, and occupy 42 cubic feet of space; when compressed these bales have a density of 22½ pounds and occupy 22½ cubic feet. Gin-compressed bales have a density of 32 to 39 pounds and occupy 13 to 16 cubic feet. It thus appears that the space required by this high-density bale is only from one-third to two-thirds that of an ordinary gin or compress bale. A freight car will carry 35 gin bales, 75 compressed bales, and 110 high-density bales, or 8.75 tons of gin bales, 18.75 tons of compressed, and 27.5 tons of high-density bales.

In spite of these facts, the railroads deny any preference to the small compact high-density bales, although trans-Atlantic steamers give them an advantage of \$1.25 per bale. My bill would guarantee a just and reasonable preference in proportion to the smaller amount of space occupied by these high-density bales.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF RADIO COMMUNICATION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I introduce a bill which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I will state that it is a bill for the coordination of the regulation and control of radio telegraphy.

The bill (S. 4038) to regulate the operation of and to foster the development of radio communication in the United States was read twice by its title.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In that connection I ask to present, to accompany the bill, a report from the Navy Department which shows the development of radio telegraphy during the war by the Navy Department, which I think is quite informing, and shows remarkable efficiency on the part of the Navy in the accomplishments which it achieved in that service. I ask that the report be printed as a Senate document and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and report of the Navy Department will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the report will be printed as a Senate document.

#### AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the shipping commissioner at Galveston, Tex., from \$1,500 to \$2,500, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. EDGE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

#### EMPLOYEES OF AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 327), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to report to the Senate the number of persons employed in the Department of Agriculture, together with a division of such employees into classes, with the number employed in each class, which classification shall show separately the number of persons employed as scientists and experts, the number of persons employed in the District of Columbia and in each of the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the number of persons employed in the Department of Agriculture separately for each year for the 10 years last past, the total appropriations and deficiencies separately for each of the 10 fiscal years last past, the amount and percentage of such appropriations used for expenditures other than salaries, wages, traveling expenses, and office expenses, and the character of such expenditures.

#### ALASKAN RAILROAD.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I offer a short resolution asking for information from the Department of the Interior, which I should like to have adopted. I am satisfied that it will involve no debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 329) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to advise the Senate—

1. What steps have been taken or are being taken to develop and settle the country traversed by and tributary to the Government railroad being constructed in Alaska.

2. What steps have been taken or are being taken to develop traffic for such railroad when built.

3. Has any organization been created charged with the duty of settling this country and developing traffic for the road; if not, why has such organization not been formed?

#### LOANS ON GOVERNMENT BONDS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion, in lieu of introducing a resolution, which I had intended to do, to call the attention of the Committee on Banking and Currency to certain communications which I have received from constituents of mine and citizens of other States in reference to the condition existing in the discount or rediscount of Liberty bonds in our reserve banks. They are complaining that when the 4½ per cent bonds are hypothecated for a loan the discount is 5 per cent. The result is that they sustain a loss in attempting to negotiate these bonds and that other paper which they hold is better collateral than the Government bonds.

Mr. President, I do not know just what legislation is needed, if any, but it is manifest to any business man that if bonds which bear 4½ per cent interest issued by the Government are to be accepted as the basis of a loan at a rate of discount or rediscount of 5 per cent it is no wonder why the bonds are now below par and that they will go still further below par, because other bonds as collateral bearing a higher rate of interest are discounted in some instances at a lower rate of interest at the reserve bank.

It is a matter which I think the Committee on Banking and Currency ought to take into consideration to see if some relief can not be given, because it is manifest that when every bank that patriotically took these liabilities of the Government for a patriotic reason and loaded themselves up with them and have carried them, and now, when they reach a point where they want to realize on the paper in attempting to rediscount or discount at the bank hypothecating them for collateral for the issuance of a loan are charged 5 per cent, the consequence is that they have been disposing of those bonds wherever they can get rid of them in order to convert them even at a loss into better interest-bearing and more negotiable paper.

I have taken this occasion to call the attention of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to this fact.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, one of the things which has had the effect of depressing the value of the bonds is the extraordinarily high rates of interest which have prevailed upon the stock exchanges.

The statutes of New York are so framed that a note of \$5,000 or more which is secured by collateral is not subject to the laws of usury. Money lenders can now charge 100 per cent for such loans. There is no usury law in New York on loans of \$5,000 which are secured by collateral. So the practice has prevailed, when it was desired to stop speculation or to cause a "bear" market, as the case might be—I am not sure just where to draw the line at times—of raising the interest rate up to 10, 15, or 20 per cent on call loans, and as high as 30 per cent has recently been charged. When that happens the commercial rates of interest rise all over the country, and commercial rates are now running from 8 to 9 per cent, which makes a tax directly upon the cost of living—there is no question about that—and has the effect, because Government bonds are bearing a low rate of interest, under 5 per cent, of "bearing" the value of such bonds. So the people who bought those bonds for patriotic purposes, amounting to \$26,000,000,000, have suffered a loss in the depreciation of \$1,750,000,000. That is the approximate loss on those bonds of the Government.

When the Treasury induces the people to buy these bonds at par it ought not to then establish a policy or permit policies of others that would lower the value of such bonds. To buy these bonds at below par by the War Finance Corporation I do not approve. It would be better to buy at par, and, better, to have the reserve banks limit loans and give lower interest on loans made.



My opinion is that the true way to stop speculation in stocks is to raise the margin and to refuse loans for such purposes. It is entirely within the discretion of the banks to refuse a loan for speculative purposes in investment securities. There was recently employed in the New York banks \$1,900,000,000 in speculative investments alone.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina rose.

Mr. OWEN. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to interrupt me?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The point I was making was not particularly in reference to the speculative feature which is complained of which exists in New York in connection with call money and time loans, but the Government at its own banks, so to speak, is charging a higher rate of discount than the interest which is allowed, so that a bank which has taken these liabilities of the Government and goes to the Federal reserve banks in order to realize a loan on them has to suffer a loss of three-fourths of 1 per cent; that is, the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent bond is being discounted now at 5 per cent. So the banks are now getting rid of such bonds as rapidly as possible.

Mr. OWEN. I think the purpose of the Federal Reserve Board is to cause the Federal reserve banks to bring some pressure on the banks for the purpose of getting them to dispose of these bonds to private holders, so as to take them out of the banks as active collateral and use such credits more largely for commercial purposes. It is much more difficult for the banks to dispose of these bonds when they are at a 10 per cent discount than if they were on a rising scale instead of on a falling scale. If the Government enters upon a new expansion of loans the Government may have to pay 6 per cent for money if the present situation continues. It is perfectly easy for the Federal Reserve Board to lower its rate of interest, and when the Federal Reserve Board is establishing a rate of interest to be charged a member bank for a loan of part of its own reserve that member bank ought to have that accommodation for 3 to 4 per cent, and a low standard of interest ought to be fixed in order to bring those bonds back to par, where they belong.

Mr. President, I wish to make the observation that the high rate on call loans could easily be checked if there were a system of biweekly settlements such as obtains in London. In that case there would be no call loans, and there would not be the fluctuations from day to day, but the rate would have to be fixed for approximately two weeks, and in that way our present difficulty could be avoided, and there would be no call loans as such. The old necessity for call loans, which arose at the period of time when the banks of the United States had no other way in which to get cash except by call loans, under which they could get it quickly in case of necessity, has passed away; the need for the call-loan system has disappeared with the development of the Federal reserve act. I call attention to that because I think Senators should realize that the necessity for that sort of thing no longer exists, and it has a very injurious effect upon the stock market in breaking the market down.

There is another matter of vital importance to the country, and to which I invite the attention of Senators, namely, that the railroads of this country are going to require somewhere in the neighborhood of five or ten billion dollars of new credit to put them in condition. How are they going to get this money if they are obliged to pay the very high current rates? They can not get it on a fair basis, and if they do not get it on a fair basis it will reflect itself in high freight rates, in high passenger rates, and in higher cost of living.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for taking a minute or two of the time of the Senate, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the situation with reference to the question of rates and discounts by Federal reserve banks. I am not usually in the habit of saying, "I told you so," but when the most important legislation concerning this matter was pending before the Senate, when we were engaged in a tremendous war, and when some who believed that we still lived in the United States of America asserted that a mistake was being made in the legislation proposed, no attention was paid to our warning. We know what the newspapers throughout the country then stated. It develops now, however, that the mistake was made at that time, and we can not get away from it. It is to that only that I desire now to call the attention of Senators.

We know now, as a matter of fact, that more than 23,000 millionaires have been made during the recent war. Those of us who at that time said that the only thing to do was to increase the taxes and to make those people pay the expenses for

carrying on the war are now being vindicated. The millions of people who bought Liberty bonds for a patriotic purpose, as stated by the two Senators who have preceded me, are now experiencing exactly what was called to the attention of the Senate at that time. The man on the farm who mortgaged his last cow in order to purchase a Liberty bond has to sell it now. You admit that now; we said so then. The only preventive for this situation was at that time to increase the rate of taxation; but you refused to do so.

I am only reminding you of the fact that for directing attention to the practice which was inaugurated through the revenue bill and merely for calling attention to what would happen in the future some of us at times were characterized as disloyal. No man but a novice would have expected anything else to follow. The millions of people who are now holding Liberty bonds will ultimately need cash and they will be glad to discount their Liberty bonds at whatever rate may be offered. So what is the use of quarreling about it? We know that the Liberty bonds will drift into the hands of the money speculators and profiteers. There were some of us who knew it at the time the legislation was enacted, and other Senators acknowledge now that it is true. They acknowledge that what we then predicted is actually happening. We are still in the United States of America; our form of government, thank God, has not changed; but at that time you permitted at least 23,000 men to become millionaires. There were about 7,000 of them before, and we now have about 30,000 millionaires, 23,000 of whom were made during the recent war.

There were, I repeat, a few of us who wanted to impose a tax of at least 80 per cent upon excess profits at that time, but a majority of the Senate refused to take such action. I am simply calling attention to that fact and to remind Senators that they can not expect now that these men who have the money will be willing to accept our Liberty bonds, although they are an obligation of the Government of the United States, without making further profit.

Mr. OWEN. "Our" Liberty bonds.

Mr. GRONNA. I mean "our" Liberty bonds, because I am one of the subscribers to the Liberty bonds; I am paying my share; but if the result of what has happened did not fall any more heavily upon anyone than upon myself I should not even complain this morning. I know, however, that the girl or the boy working in the shop and in the factory who paid 100 cents on the dollar for Liberty bonds—one or two or three of them, perhaps—will ultimately have to dispose of them at a discount. That is unfair to them; but, my friends, the mistake was made at the time we enacted the revenue law.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator's opinion as to the rate of 30 per cent on loans in New York.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, that is indefensible, I will say to the Senator, and I agree with him that whatever is done in New York, that being our largest city, is reflected throughout the entire country. I also entirely agree with the Senator that, so far as the unlimited discounts are concerned which are being permitted to be made in any place in the United States, I do not approve of them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the present market value of Liberty bonds can, I think, be very easily explained. It is not due to the need of certain holders of limited means for ready cash, although that may have some influence in the equation. The Saturday Evening Post of last week contained a very illuminating article on the subject—at least it was illuminating to me. Speculative dealers in questionable securities issued by questionable enterprises, false pretenders, and swindlers throughout the country have been able to reap a rich harvest from the average holders of Liberty bonds by appealing to their cupidity and holding out promises of enormous returns to be realized upon their own enterprises. As a result many millions, perhaps billions, of dollars of Liberty bonds have been surrendered by the holders in exchange for stocks and securities which are practically worthless, and the new holders of these bonds have converted them into cash and used them for loans. The fall in the value of the bonds is, therefore, inevitable, for the market is glutted with them. That has occurred irrespective of our system of taxation. It is simply the operation of natural laws upon conditions which are scandalous, but which nevertheless exist, and for which the Government is blameless.

While I am on my feet I wish to direct attention, however, to one phase of the discount requirements of the Federal Reserve Board which, in my judgment, is subject to very serious criticism.

The  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent loan certificates, in which banks and individuals have invested to enable the Government to continue to meet its usual expenditures, and the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent Liberty bonds, were



purchased, as I am assured, upon the express assurance of the Government that the discount rate would not be raised above the interest-bearing covenant of the bonds and certificates. I know of one bank which invested \$10,000,000 in these certificates of indebtedness upon this assurance, but to-day the discount rate in that reserve division is 5 per cent for both sets of securities, and that, if my information is correct, involves a breach of faith by the Government with their holders.

I, of course, am aware of the necessity of raising discount rates if any limitation is to be placed upon the already undue expansion of credit; but unless the Government keeps faith with those who invest their money with it upon the strength of its assurances it will not be surprising if confidence be shaken in prevailing methods of banking.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I just want to call attention to the logical result of this situation of discounting at a higher rate than the obligation bears.

As the Senator from Colorado says, those who are compelled to liquidate or realize upon these bonds, finding that the rate of discount is greater than the rate of interest they receive, and needing the money, are going to dispose of the bonds, because every time one pays a higher rate of interest than the instrument bears that is a discount on the paper itself. The result inevitably is that those bonds that are held by individuals of limited means will find a market, while those who have unlimited means, knowing that the Government will redeem its promise and pay the interest will hold their bonds. The result is, inevitably, a constant pressure to force the bonds out of weak hands into strong hands, and ultimately to cause them to drift into the pockets of those who are able to hold the bonds without realizing upon them.

I was not aware of the fact stated by the Senator that there was an understanding between the Government and the purchasers that the rate of discount should not exceed the rate of interest borne by the bonds. Nothing will go so far to stabilize the price of the bonds and to hold them in the hands of the individuals who now own them as having it understood that the rate of discount when they are hypothecated for a loan shall not exceed the rate of interest that they bear.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss this question, but I simply wish to say that it is not altogether the person who holds one bond that is selling these bonds. The banks of the country have been forced to sell them, and the largest purchaser of the bonds is the United States itself. I want to say that the United States is buying these bonds at a discount to-day, and it is buying them just as low as it can possibly get them, and I am not stating this by way of complaint.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, just before the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] made his assault upon the present revenue law I was called out of the Chamber, and have just returned.

Without entering into any controversy with the Senator, I want to say that his attack upon the revenue legislation of the Congress is, in my judgment, wholly unwarranted. It was not the revenue legislation that made the large number of millionaires to which he refers. The increase in the number of millionaires as the result of the war has been considerable, but when the war started we had quite an army of millionaires in this country. The number that have been added to the list as the result of the war probably is not more than the number of millionaires created out of the Civil War. The Civil War started without any millionaires in this country and ended with a great many millionaires, and wars have generally resulted in the creation of millionaires, here and everywhere else.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure that upon reflection the Senator will not make that statement, because it was reported that we had only about 7,000 millionaires in this country before the war.

Mr. SIMMONS. Oh, that was a very great underestimate. It was reported from some sources that we had many more than that. From other sources there was a disposition to minimize the number, and they probably worked it down to 7,000; but that is immaterial.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, does not the Senator know that the reports show that we have 30,000 millionaires in this country now?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I do not know that, and I do not think that is true; but the point I am making is this: Relatively speaking—and when I say "relatively speaking," I speak with reference to the wealth of this country at the time of the Civil War and at the time of the great World War—relatively speaking, the number of millionaires that were added to the list as a

direct result of the World War was not greater than those that were added to the list as the result of the Civil War. But, Mr. President, that is not the gravamen of the Senator's charge. The Senator charges that if he and a handful of gentlemen who cooperated with him in an effort to about double the taxes that were to be imposed upon the people of this country for war purposes had succeeded we would not have had these millionaires, and we would not have had the great debt that we now have. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the debt that we now have is only about one-half the sum that it was estimated by the Senator and some of his colleagues in their fight against the war-revenue bill as the probable size of our public indebtedness.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that when the second revenue act was passed the President of the United States himself recommended an increase in the rates.

Mr. SIMMONS. There might have been some recommendation of that sort on the excess-profits tax. There might have been some recommendation upon the income tax.

Mr. GRONNA. I know the Senator does not wish to misquote me intentionally. The Senator is mistaken when he says that I said we would not have so many millionaires. I do not know how many millionaires we are going to have, because these men have made not only one million, but several; but I do say we would not have had so many debts and so many bonds.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and before the war commenced, Mr. President, from other causes chiefly growing out of legislation we had not only millionaires but multimillionaires and billionaires in this country.

Mr. President, it was estimated by those gentlemen when we were passing that revenue bill that unless we increased the rate of taxation to the extent that they demanded, which was nearly double what we placed upon a part of the industries of this country, we would have a debt of from fifty to sixty billions of dollars at the close of the war.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator ought also to call the attention of the American people to the fact that the taxes imposed upon America on account of the war were higher than the taxes imposed upon any other country in the world.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will get to that. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, if we had imposed the high rate of taxes that was demanded by two or three here in the Senate at the time the first revenue bill was under discussion, the industries of this country would have been so handicapped by that rate of taxation that they would not have been able to have functioned in the splendid and magnificent way that they did, and that made it possible for us to win the war. As the Senator from Utah has stated, we imposed upon the wealth of this country a higher rate of taxation than any country in the world has ever placed in time of war upon its wealth.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the Senator is aware of the fact that every dollar of this enormous tax that could be passed right on to the consumer, and instead of laying a tax upon wealth in its ultimate analysis it rests upon the producers of the country.

Mr. SIMMONS. I know that the consumers have caught it, and they always do catch it. You can not levy any tax in this country without the consumer catching it. But if we had doubled the tax, as the Senator says we ought to have done, and the consumer has caught what we did levy, the consumers would have gotten twice as heavy a burden as they have had to bear.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, it was argued by the Senator himself that some of the people would be taxed as high as 60 per cent under the first bill, was it not?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think some of them were, and more than that.

Mr. GRONNA. It is hardly fair to say that I advocated doubling the taxes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Some Senator on the other side, following the Senator from North Dakota and his special friend, did propose here one day to impose a tax that was more than 100 per cent.

Mr. GRONNA. I shall show from the Record that there were not only two or three with me for increasing the rate of taxation, but I want the Record to show the votes, and the Senator will find that there was a very large number above three who were in favor of increasing the tax.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will increase the number to five, then, if three does not satisfy the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator will find that there were more than that number.



Mr. SIMMONS. There were not many more than five. Mr. President, the only point I wish to make is that the tax which we levied was higher than that levied by any other nation on the face of the earth, even in times of war; and the great bulk of that taxation was primarily placed upon the productive wealth of this country. Practically every dollar of the excess-profits tax fell upon the productive industries of the country. The surtax which we imposed in the income-tax bill was a tax which reached not the poor, not the man of moderate means, not the well to do, but reached the wealth of the country, and I will say to the Senator that a large part of that was imposed in a form which made it impossible to pass it to the consumer.

I want to say to the Senator right now that if we had not levied the tax we did, but had followed him, the Government would have broken down in its finances, in my judgment, because it would have imposed such a burden upon the industries of the country as would have crippled them, and made it impossible for them to respond as readily and as effectively as they did to the demands of the Government.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator is making a statement which is not warranted by the facts. I can call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to some of the ablest financiers, who have criticized the revenue act. He need not take my statement for it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, Mr. President, I have no doubt that the ablest financiers have done it, because the clients of the ablest financiers were the people who were mulcted by the system of taxation. I want to say right now, that, in my judgment, no other country in the world ever solved the great problem of financing the greatest war in history by the greatest and wealthiest country in the world as it was solved by the finance measure which we passed here with practically the assent of both sides of this Chamber.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LODGE. I yield for a moment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina made some statements which I do not believe are warranted by the facts or can be sustained from the records. He referred to my "special friend." I suppose he referred to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who, on September 3, offered an amendment providing for a 70 per cent tax on war profits. There were 20 Senators who voted for that amendment, and, without reading, I ask that the names of those 20 Senators be inserted in the RECORD.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] kindly yielded to me for just a moment. I can not make the reply to the Senator from North Carolina which I would make, and which I shall make in the near future. I shall give him an opportunity to demonstrate and to go into detail, and I invite him now to prepare his data, but to prepare it from the records and not from memory.

Mr. President, I ask that these votes be printed in the RECORD, showing the number of votes cast for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, and that the amendment also be printed.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Page —, No. 1368. Date, September 3, 1917. Proposed by LA FOLLETTE. Amendment to committee amendment to bill H. R. 4280, revenue bill for war expenses, for 70 per cent tax on war profits.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment reported by the committee it is proposed to strike out all of page 12 after the parenthesis in line 13, all of page 13 down to and including line 22, and insert after the parenthesis in line 13, page 12, the words "70 per cent upon war profits (determined as hereinafter provided)."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

YEAS—20.

Ashurst	Hollis	Kenyon	McNary
Borah	Husting	King	Norris
Brady	Johnson, Calif.	Kirby	Thompson
Gore	Johnson, S. Dak.	La Follette	Trammell
Gronna	Jones, Wash.	McKellar	Vardaman

NAYS—55.

Bankhead	Fernald	Kendrick	Overman
Brandagee	Fletcher	Knox	Owen
Broussard	France	Lewis	Page
Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Penrose
Colt	Gerry	McCumber	Pittman
Culberson	Hale	Martin	Poinceter
Curtis	Harding	Myers	Pomerene
Dillingham	James	New	Ransdell
Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	Newlands	Robinson

Saulsbury	Simmons	Sterling	Watson
Shafroth	Smith, Ga.	Stone	Weeks
Sheppard	Smith, Md.	Underwood	Williams
Sherman	Smith, Mich.	Wadsworth	Wolcott
Shields	Smoot	Warren	

NOT VOTING—21.

Beckham	Hitchcock	Reed	Tillman
Calder	Hughes	Smith, Ariz.	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Smith, S. C.	Walsh
Gallinger	McLean	Sutherland	
Goff	Nelson	Swanson	
Hardwick	Phelan	Thomas	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

RECLASSIFICATION COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], from the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, reported out a resolution this morning for the continuation of certain work of the Reclassification Commission after the commission shall have rendered its report. I would like to ask that that resolution may be taken up for consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects. The morning business is closed. [At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.]

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a moment.

INTEREST ON COLLATERAL CALL LOANS.

Mr. OWEN. I ask leave to offer a resolution, which is a resolution of inquiry from the Federal Reserve Board.

The resolution (S. Res. 328) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Federal Reserve Board be, and is hereby, directed to advise the Senate what is the cause and justification for the usurious rates of interest on collateral call loans in the financial centers, under what law authorized, and what steps, if any, are required to abate this condition.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany in open executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. GORE. I desire to give notice of my intention to offer the reservation which I send to the desk to the pending resolution of ratification. I ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the proposed reservation for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

The United States understands that no mandatory power shall, without the consent of the council, enjoy any monopoly, privilege, or preference in respect of the natural resources or the acquisition, development, and operation of the same in any territory placed under its control, influence, or mandate; and the United States further understands that no member of the league shall, without the consent of the council, enjoy any monopoly, privilege, or preference prejudicial to the equal rights and opportunities of any other member in respect of the natural resources or the acquisition, development, or operation of the same situated in any colony, dependency, or sphere of influence, its title or claim to which shall have been vested or confirmed by the treaty or by virtue of the action or authority of the league itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed reservation will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it was manifest on Saturday that the Senate is very anxious to proceed as rapidly as possible with the remaining reservations so as to reach reservation No. 2, affecting article 10. I ask unanimous consent that on all the remaining reservations except the reservation No. 2, relating to article 10, each Senator be limited to 20 minutes' debate on each reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the proposed agreement.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that on all remaining reservations except reservation 2, relating to article 10, each Senator shall be limited to 20 minutes' debate on each reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say that I think that is too strict a limitation on reservation 14. That is a serious matter, and I should like to have it excepted from the request.

Mr. LODGE. If I can get an agreement by making an exception of reservation 14 I am ready to do so. I should like to get the agreement I have proposed as to the rest of the reservations.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.



Mr. POMERENE. Is the unanimous-consent agreement as presented intended to include all new reservations which may be offered?

Mr. LODGE. No; only the remaining reservations, prior to reaching reservation No. 14 and reservation No. 2, which covers article 10.

Mr. THOMAS. Including amendments to the reservations?

Mr. LODGE. It includes everything.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is to say, 20 minutes are allowed on an amendment?

Mr. LODGE. No; 20 minutes on each reservation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator. I do not understand that the unanimous-consent is intended to apply to the question on the adoption of the resolution of ratification itself?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; that comes after we get into the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be again read, as I entered the Chamber after it was read. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will again read the proposed agreement.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

That on all remaining reservations, except reservations 2 and 14, each Senator shall be limited to 20 minutes' debate on each reservation.

Mr. REED. As drawn, it would include reservations which might hereafter be offered.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is not so intended. It says "the remaining reservations."

Mr. REED. Suppose, so that there will be no misunderstanding, we make it read, "the so-called Lodge reservations."

Mr. LODGE. We might say "the remaining pending reservations," but they are not pending. There is only one pending at a time. That does not cover it.

Mr. REED. Why not name them, and then there would be no doubt?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They could be stated as "the committee reservations."

Mr. LODGE. They are committee reservations. Let it read "the remaining Foreign Relations Committee reservations, except reservation 2 and reservation 14."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to correct the Assistant Secretary that it is not article 14, but reservation No. 14. Exception is made in favor of reservation No. 2 and reservation No. 14.

Mr. LODGE. That is the way it is worded.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think he read "article 14."

Mr. LODGE. I do not think he could have read "article 14."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have it reread.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read again.

The Assistant Secretary. As originally presented it read:

That on all remaining reservations, except the reservation to article 10, each Senator shall be limited to 20 minutes' debate on each reservation.

As now amended it reads:

That on all remaining Foreign Relations Committee reservations, except the reservation to article 10 and reservation No. 14, each Senator shall be limited to 20 minutes' debate on each reservation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. "And amendments thereto," I would suggest. As it stands, anybody can offer substitutes and amendments forever.

Mr. LODGE. No; we are still speaking about the reservations.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think if a Senator offered a substitute for it—

Mr. LODGE. Let it read "reservations and amendments thereto," if desired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is unanimously entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that on all remaining Foreign Relations Committee reservations, except the reservation to article 10 and reservation No. 14, each Senator shall be limited to 20 minutes' debate on each reservation and amendments thereto.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he could not extend his request to a final vote on the reservation to article 10 this week?

Mr. LODGE. I can not do so, because there is objection to putting a limitation on reservation 14 and reservation 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] to reservation No. 9.

Mr. LODGE. An amendment was offered to it by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An amendment was proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick], sent to the desk, but not formally offered.

Mr. McCORMICK. It was sent to the desk, read, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That being true, the question is upon the substitute offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

Mr. McCORMICK. I offer the amendment to the substitute as proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the amendment proposed now by the Senator from Illinois.

The Assistant Secretary. Add at the end of the proposed substitute offered by the Senator from Indiana, after the word "Congress," in that substitute, the following:

And the United States reserves the right to increase its armament without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

Mr. NEW. I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to my substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana accepts the amendment and modifies his amendment accordingly. The question now is upon the substitute offered by the Senator from Indiana as modified.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. REED called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LODGE (when Mr. DILLINGHAM's name was called). The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is necessarily absent to-day. If present, he would vote "yea." He has a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I agreed to take care of him by a pair during his absence. I find, however, that I can transfer my pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], which I do, and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], and on this question I vote "nay." I ask that the announcement of my pair and its transfer may stand for the day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote upon this amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. NEWBERRY] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is absent on account of illness, to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness. He is paired by a transfer on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. If present, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN entered the Chamber and voted in the affirmative.

Mr. GRONNA. A moment ago I made the statement that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] having now voted, I withdraw that announcement and merely state that if present the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on this question would vote "yea."

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to announce that on this question I am paired. If I had not been paired I would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family, and the Senator from Mas-



sachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is necessarily absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 27, as follows:

## YEAS—49.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Shields
Ball	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Gronna	McNary	Smoot
Brandeggee	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Norris	Wadsworth
Curtis	Keyes	Nugent	Warren
Edge	Kirby	Page	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Philpps	
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	
France	Lodge	Sherman	

## NAYS—27.

Beckham	Harrison	Overman	Smith, Md.
Dial	Hitchcock	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Fletcher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polindexter	Trammell
Gay	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Kendrick	Ransdell	Williams
Glass	King	Sheppard	Wolcott
Harris	McKellar	Simmons	

## NOT VOTING—19.

Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Swanson
Culberson	La Follette	Phelan	Thomas
Dillingham	McCumber	Robinson	Underwood
Fall	Newberry	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mass.
Harding	Owen	Stanley	

So Mr. New's substitute for reservation No. 10 was agreed to, as follows:

No plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the League of Nations under the provisions of article 8 shall be held as binding the United States until the same shall have been accepted by Congress, and the United States reserves the right to increase its armament without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon agreeing to the reservation as amended.

Mr. LODGE. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the question, as I understand, now recurs upon the reservation as amended?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the situation in which it finds itself by the action just taken. The reservation under consideration originally read as follows:

10. If the United States shall at any time adopt any plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the League of Nations under the provisions of article 8, it reserves the right to increase such armaments without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

The important point being that after the plan is proposed by the council, and after the plan is adopted and approved by the United States, then, under this, the United States reserves the right to increase its armament in time of war or when threatened with war or invasion, the plan to the contrary notwithstanding. That was the question over which the discussion arose, as to whether the right should be reserved by the United States to increase its armament after it had adopted a plan which presumably did not give it that right. It was argued that if the United States desired to exercise that right it would not approve the plan, and when the plan came before Congress it would reject it if it did not so provide. But, Mr. President, see what we have done. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] moved as a substitute for that the reservation as it had been tentatively agreed upon by the bipartisan conference, as follows:

No plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the League of Nations under the provisions of article 8 shall be held as binding the United States until the same shall have been accepted by Congress.

It will be observed that that leaves out the provision under which the United States, after it had agreed to the plan recommended by the council, could then increase its armament, and yet, marvelous to relate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] proposes to add to that draft of the reservation the very matter which it was intended by the substitute to exclude, namely, the language—

It reserves the right to increase such armaments without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

So after all this learned discussion we have got back to the very point from which we started. Now, I submit, is not that absurd? Of course if that proposition is to be embraced by the Senate as expressive of its ideas, let the Lodge resolution alone, reject the substitute, and vote upon the original Lodge resolution. We put ourselves in a perfectly ridiculous attitude by this sort of procedure.

I really think that some Senator who voted for the substitute of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] as amended by the McCormick amendment ought to arise and move to reconsider or that it ought by unanimous consent to be reconsidered, and we ought to vote upon the original Lodge reservation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the subject of the vote is determined by the parliamentary situation. It is on the reservation as amended, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I inquire whether a motion at this time to reconsider the vote by which the New substitute as amended by the McCormick amendment was adopted would be in order?

Mr. LODGE. It would be, if made by some Senator who voted on the prevailing side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of opinion that a motion to reconsider would be in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I trust some Senator will make the motion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move to reconsider the vote just taken in order that a vote may be had on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] to the substitute reservation.

Mr. LODGE. I move to lay the motion upon the table, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to lay upon the table the motion to reconsider of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. On that motion the Senator from Massachusetts asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Announcing my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and its transfer to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY]. I desire this announcement to stand for all votes to-day. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Reiterating the explanation made upon the last roll call, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 32, as follows:

## YEAS—45.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Shields
Borah	Gore	McNary	Smoot
Brandeggee	Gronna	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Hale	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	New	Sutherland
Colt	Kellogg	Norris	Townsend
Cummins	Kenyon	Owen	Wadsworth
Curtis	Keyes	Page	Warren
Edge	Knox	Philpps	Watson
Elkins	Kirby	Polindexter	
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	
France	Lodge	Sherman	
	McCormick		

## NAYS—32.

Ashurst	Henderson	Myers	Simmons
Beckham	Hitchcock	Nugent	Smith, Ga.
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smith, Md.
Fletcher	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Gay	Kendrick	Pittman	Trammell
Gerry	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	Kirby	Ransdell	Williams
Harrison	McKellar	Sheppard	Wolcott

## NOT VOTING—18.

Calder	Harris	Penrose	Thomas
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Robinson	Underwood
Dillingham	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	McCumber	Stanley	
Harding	Newberry	Swanson	

So Mr. LODGE's motion to lay upon the table Mr. HENDERSON's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon agreeing to reservation No. 10 as amended.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.



The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Announcing my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Announcing the same transfer as on the previous roll call, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the explanation made on the last roll call, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 26, as follows:

#### YEAS—49.

Ball	Gore	McLean	Shields
Borah	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Spencer
Chamberlain	Kellogg	New	Sterling
Colt	Kenyon	Norris	Sutherland
Cummins	Keyes	Nugent	Townsend
Curtis	King	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Kirby	Phelan	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Phipps	Watson
Fernald	Lenroot	Poindexter	
France	Lodge	Reed	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	

#### NAYS—26.

Beckham	Harrison	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Dial	Henderson	Pittman	Trammell
Fletcher	Hitchcock	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ransdell	Williams
Gerry	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Wolcott
Glass	Kendrick	Simmons	
Harris	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

#### NOT VOTING—20.

Ashurst	Harding	Newberry	Stanley
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Swanson
Culberson	La Follette	Penrose	Thomas
Dillingham	McCumber	Robinson	Underwood
Fall	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mass.

So reservation No. 10 as amended was agreed to, as follows:

No plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the League of Nations under the provisions of article 8 shall be held as binding the United States until the same shall have been accepted by Congress, and the United States reserves the right to increase its armament without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to reservation No. 11, and I move to amend it, in line 7, by striking out the words "that violating said article 16" and inserting "such covenant-breaking State."

That is to correct an error in the original reservation. The insertion of the words "that violating said article 16" was a misprint, which the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] tried to correct on the 19th of November, but objection was made at that stage to anything, and therefore it was not accomplished. This is simply to correct that error.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to have the reservation stated as it would then read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to state the question, and the reservation as proposed to be amended shall then be stated. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In line 7 of the reservation it is proposed to strike out the words "that violating said article 16" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "such covenant-breaking State," so that if amended the reservation will read:

11. The United States reserves the right to permit, in its discretion, the nationals of a covenant-breaking State, as defined in article 16 of the covenant of the League of Nations, residing within the United States or in countries other than such covenant-breaking State, to continue their commercial, financial, and personal relations with the nationals of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. The amendment which he is now offering is different from the one which he proposed to offer, as found upon this printed copy?

Mr. LODGE. It is. I do not propose to offer that. It was never agreed upon—neither that nor the one to the first reservation. I offered the one to the first reservation as an experi-

ment, and the Senator and his friends voted it down; and I am not going to offer this one, to which I object, and which is a substantial change.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not any desire to quibble with the Senator. I do not care how bad he makes his reservations. They are easier to vote against on that account. I only wanted to get the matter clarified. He has put upon our desks a printed copy of what he proposes to offer, but he is now offering something different.

Mr. LODGE. I am. I withdrew that, and offered another, which I believe is parliamentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to reservation No. 11. Those in favor of the amendment will say "aye." [A pause.] Those opposed will say "no." [A pause.] The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. So there are some who vote against correcting a typographical error!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on reservation No. 11, as amended.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. REED called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LODGE (when Mr. DILLINGHAM's name was called). The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is obliged to be absent to-day. If present, he would vote "yea." He has a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I ask that that announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same explanation, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 28, as follows:

#### YEAS—44.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Reed
Borah	Gore	McLean	Sherman
Brandeggee	Gronna	McNary	Shields
Capper	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Colt	Henderson	Nelson	Spencer
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	New	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Norris	Sutherland
Edge	Kenyon	Owen	Townsend
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Fernald	Lenroot	Phipps	Warren
France	Lodge	Poindexter	Watson

#### NAYS—28.

Beckham	Harris	Kirby	Simmons
Chamberlain	Harrison	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Dial	Hitchcock	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Fletcher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Trammell
Gay	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Kendrick	Ransdell	Williams
Glass	King	Sheppard	Wolcott

#### NOT VOTING—23.

Ashurst	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Stanley
Calder	Knox	Pittman	Swanson
Culberson	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Dillingham	McCumber	Robinson	Underwood
Fall	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mass.
Harding	Newberry	Smith, Ga.	

So reservation No. 11, reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, was agreed to, as follows:

11. The United States reserves the right to permit, in its discretion, the nationals of a covenant-breaking State, as defined in article 16 of the covenant of the League of Nations, residing within the United States or in countries other than such covenant-breaking State, to continue their commercial, financial, and personal relations with the nationals of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I move now the adoption of reservation No. 12.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I understand that reservation No. 12 originated with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I have never been able to get any information from any source whatever which gives me any idea as to the operation of that reservation or who it is the reservation is intended to take care of or the character of cases it is intended to take care of. I should like to have from the Senator from New York, if he can give us an illustration, some concrete case to which the reservation would be applicable.



Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am not certain that I can give a concrete case. My attention was called to the language of the annex to article 297 of the treaty itself, which will be found upon page 137 of the printed copy of the treaty which I have in my hand. Article 297 of the treaty itself has to do with the property rights and interests of citizens of the belligerent nations, property rights and interests of enemy aliens generally, and the settlement of those interests under the treaty.

The annex to which I have referred reads in part as follows:

In accordance with the provisions of article 297, paragraph (d), the validity of vesting orders and of orders for the winding up of businesses or companies, and of any other orders, directions, decisions, or instructions of any court or any department of the Government of any of the high contracting parties made or given, or purporting to be made or given, in pursuance of war legislation with regard to enemy property, rights, and interests is confirmed. The interests of all persons shall be regarded as having been effectively dealt with by any order, direction, decision, or instruction dealing with property in which they may be interested.

The term "all persons" is infinitely more comprehensive than the term "enemy aliens," and if construed as the English language is ordinarily construed, in this connection it would include American citizens as well as enemy aliens who happen to have resided in the United States during the war and whose property was dealt with by our Government.

The object of this reservation is to see to it that in the event of American citizens having had rights or interests in property which has been dealt with by our Government as owned in whole or in part by enemy alien interests they shall have their right hereafter to appeal to the courts of the United States and not be debarred from such an appeal by the language of this annex, which otherwise, if no reservation is adopted, confirms everything that was done and closes the door against all persons. The reservation is interpretative in that respect. I think myself that the meaning of the phrase "all persons" would include, of course, citizens of the United States. I do not believe there was a real intention to do it, but as the annex reads it does do it. I can see no objection whatever to an interpretative reservation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. From what page does the Senator read?

Mr. WADSWORTH. From page 137 of the printed copy of the treaty. It is the annex to article 297. I have not read it all. It goes further and is even stronger.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. What paragraph of the annex?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Paragraph 1. It goes further and says:

No question shall be raised as to the regularity of a transfer of any property rights or interests dealt with in pursuance of any such order, direction, decision, or instruction.

And all persons are involved.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not able to follow the Senator, because I have not been able to turn to it, but the Senator has not given us any concrete case at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I said at the beginning that I was not aware of a concrete case. An opinion has been expressed by lawyers in whom I have confidence that cases may arise in the future that would fall within the provisions of this annex and involve the rights of American citizens. I think it is almost certain that such an event will arise, for it must be remembered that our Government dealt with something like three-quarters of a billion or a billion dollars worth of property—I forget the exact figures—which was enemy alien property, and it is almost certain that some American citizens had some rights or property interests in that property as minority stockholders or had some contracts with concerns that were taken over.

This reservation makes no reflection upon our Government whatsoever, but simply attempts to secure to American citizens the rights they would ordinarily have at any time. They would not be debarred from pressing their rights as the result of the ratification of the treaty with this annex.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it strikes me as something marvelous in the extreme that the Senate of the United States should be incorporating a reservation in the resolution of ratification of a treaty when no one is able to give a plain and concise statement of any existing state of facts to which the provision would be applicable, nor even to suppose a state of facts to which the provision would be applicable.

I am merely guessing about it, but I guess that this reservation means this: The Alien Property Custodian took into his possession property which he estimated and which he considered to be of the value of something like three-quarters of a billion dollars, as suggested by the Senator from New York. The owners of that property contend that it is worth three or four times, perhaps ten times, that amount; at least, it is not at all improbable that if they had an opportunity to present claims for it they would assert claims for somewhere between \$5,000,000,000 and \$10,000,000,000.

It is perfectly well known that in the case of a large amount of that property the stock, which really belonged to alien enemies, was put in the names of American citizens. That fact has been disclosed in hearings before committees of the Senate, and it is a matter of public notoriety. These individuals set up the claim that the stock belonged to them individually as against the contention of the Government that it was really held in trust for alien enemies, and I take it that this provision, which we are now to endeavor to make a part of the resolution of ratification of this treaty, is to take care of the interests of those American citizens who claim to have held this stock in their own right, as against the contention of the Government that they were mere dummies holding it for foreign and alien enemy interests.

Of course, it is broad enough to take care of their rights, as well as of the rights of the man who in good faith, and honestly, asserted a right as an American citizen in property taken over by the Alien Property Custodian. But the real claimant, the man who is complaining about it, in about 90 per cent of the cases, at least, I dare say will be found to be a mere colorable holder for the enemy alien.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But, Mr. President, it would be a matter of no consequence if his claim were asserted in perfect good faith, and if he actually owned it in his own right, and he was an American citizen. There is nothing in the treaty that can possibly affect his rights in any way, shape, or manner, and there is not a lawyer upon this floor, I undertake to say, who will assert that his rights could be affected in any way, shape, or manner.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield first, if the Senator from Massachusetts will pardon me, to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], as he rose first.

Mr. REED. The Senator says that there might be some honest claimants. The Senator would not object to giving them their day in court?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly not. You can not take their day in court away from them, and that is the point I am making. The Constitution of the United States takes care of them by providing that no man shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

Mr. REED. When I rose the Senator had not reached that point. I am inclined to think that the Senator would be found to be right on the last proposition, and I am inclined to concur with him. In view of the fact that there are honest claimants, or may be honest claimants as well as dishonest claimants, what is the objection to giving them all a day in our courts and saying so plainly in this instance, so that that question will not have to be fought over as a preliminary to a court proceeding?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We do not need it here at all because it is already taken care of. It is taken care of in a better way than the treaty can take care of it. It is taken care of by the Constitution of the United States. Whether a man is honest or dishonest in his claim, if he is an American citizen you can not take away from him the right to have a court adjudicate whether he is entitled to property or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Then this just leaves it where our Constitution leaves it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I feel that I should yield to the Senator from Massachusetts if he desires to interrogate me.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wanted to say that I can not see that it would do any possible harm to reserve this privilege to American citizens. If they have it already, they will go into courts. I have confidence in the courts of the United States, and it does not trouble me that we are protecting the rights of American citizens even if we are overprotecting them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield now to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should like to ask the Senator if the paragraph at the end of the annex, in the last sentence, does not take care of the matter just as well as the reservation proposed by the Senator from New York. The proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not be held to prejudice the titles to property heretofore acquired in good faith and for value and in accordance with the laws of the country in which the property is situated by nationals of the allied and associated powers.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should say that it does.

Mr. LODGE. But that does not get by the "any person." The "any person" is the point. "Any person" is every person.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. "Their nationals" will be nationals of the allied and associated powers. There are no other persons except enemy aliens and neutrals, and those apparently are the ones to be taken care of.

Mr. LODGE. This reservation gives no protection to enemy aliens, and the Senator is well aware of that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not quite so sure about it.

Mr. LODGE. This provides for American citizens. An enemy alien is not a citizen of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. In any case, in view of the provision to which our attention is called by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], it can only protect neutrals, not citizens of the United States or citizens of any of our allies, because they are already protected by the very article to which the reservation is directed. If that is not the situation—

Mr. LODGE. It can not protect anybody but citizens of the United States who are named in it. It does not protect neutrals.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from New York can shed any more light on it, and if I have not stated the case as it is, I should be very glad to be advised about it, because I am groping in the dark about it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This matter was the subject of some discussion in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the discussion was printed as a part of the hearings. I was not present at the time, not being a member of that committee, but it was suggested that the language of this paragraph of annex 1 of article 297 was ambiguous, and grave doubt was expressed by some members of the Committee on Foreign Relations as to whether the use of the words "all persons" would not include citizens of the United States. This reservation is simply to make it clear.

Mr. LODGE. That is all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does not protect neutrals, neutrals are not mentioned in it; it does not protect enemy aliens, enemy aliens are not mentioned in it. It says rights of citizens of the United States, and that is all. What objection there can be to it passes my comprehension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on reservation No. 12, reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I can see no real objection to the reservation except that in the instance cited by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] American citizens, having had shares of stock or property transferred to them nominally, might be used to protect alien enemies. That is the only question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But our courts can be trusted to decide things of that sort and to make a decision justly.

Mr. FLETCHER. It may be very difficult to uncover a fraud of that kind. I do not know of any such instances, but there is a possibility that there might be some collusion there.

Mr. LODGE. I think the courts are quite as likely to uncover it and reach a just verdict as is the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to suggest to the Senator that if the treaty does cut off the claim of an American citizen who claims that he is a stockholder, but may not be, it would also cut off claims of all other good-faith American citizens. If it did in the one case it would in the other.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not question that, but I quite agree with the Senator from Montana that every right of every citizen of the United States is protected by the Constitution of the United States, and the proviso at the end of the paragraph, it seems to me, fully settles that.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield there? Under the proviso it will be necessary for a claimant to show that he acquired the property for value. Does the Senator think that an American citizen, with no German rights involved, in order to substantiate his claim to his own property, must prove that he acquired it for value? He might have secured it by gift.

Mr. FLETCHER. In accordance with the laws of the country or in good faith.

Mr. LENROOT. And for value.

Mr. LODGE. I call for the yeas and nays on agreeing to the reservation.

Mr. GERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandegee	Harris	McLean	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Smoot
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Spencer
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Dial	Kellogg	Page	Thomas
Elkins	Kendrick	Phelan	Trammell
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phipps	Wadsworth
Gay	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Kirby	Reed	Watson
Glass	Knox	Sheppard	Williams
Gore	Lodge	Sherman	Wolcott
Hale	McKellar	Shields	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The yeas and nays have been requested on agreeing to the reservation.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). In the absence of my pair I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is absent on account of sickness. I have been unable to secure a transfer of that pair, and therefore must withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. As I am unable to secure a pair for him, I simply wish to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I have not seen him present at this vote. Therefore I transfer my pair with him to my colleague [Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HARRIS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 27, as follows:

#### YEAS—45.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Shields
Brandegee	Gore	McLean	Smoot
Capper	Gronna	McNary	Spencer
Chamberlain	Hale	Moses	Sterling
Colt	Henderson	Myers	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Kenyon	Phipps	Warren
Elkins	Keyes	Poinexter	Watson
Fernald	Knox	Pomerene	
Fletcher	Lenroot	Reed	
France	Lodge	Sherman	

#### NAYS—27.

Beckham	Harrison	McKellar	Simmons
Culberson	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Gay	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Trammell
Gerry	Kendrick	Phelan	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	King	Pittman	Wolcott
Harris	Kirby	Sheppard	

#### NOT VOTING—23.

Ashurst	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Swanson
Borah	La Follette	Ransdell	Thomas
Calder	McCumber	Robinson	Underwood
Dillingham	New	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	Newberry	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Harding	Overman	Stanley	

So reservation No. 12, reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, was agreed to, as follows:

12. Nothing in articles 296, 297, or in any of the annexes thereto or in any other article, section, or annex of the treaty of peace with Germany shall, as against citizens of the United States, be taken to mean any confirmation, ratification, or approval of any act otherwise illegal or in contravention of the rights of citizens of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I now move the adoption of reservation No. 13. There has been no amendment proposed to that reservation.

Mr. KING. Let the reservation be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reservation will be stated.



The reservation reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was read, as follows:

13. The United States withholds its assent to part 13 (articles 387 to 427, inclusive) unless Congress by act or joint resolution shall hereafter make provision for representation in the organization established by said part 13, and in such event the participation of the United States will be governed and conditioned by the provisions of such act or joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the reservation.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair and its transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). Making the same statement as heretofore regarding my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I am informed that my pair if present would vote in the affirmative upon this reservation. I am, therefore, at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is absent on account of illness. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to repeat the announcement that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. Making the same announcement regarding my pair as heretofore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer the general pair which I have with the junior Senator from Montana to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GRONNA. In view of the announcement of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], I simply wish to state that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] stands paired by transfer with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). My general pair, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is still absent, but on this question I am sure that he and I would vote alike. Therefore I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. KELLOGG (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who, I understand, has not voted. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 27, as follows:

#### YEAS—44.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Reed
Borah	Gore	McLean	Sherman
Brandagee	Gronna	McNary	Shields
Capper	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Spencer
Cummins	Kellogg	Nelson	Sterling
Curtis	Kenyon	New	Sutherland
Edge	Keyes	Norris	Thomas
Elkins	King	Page	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Phipps	Wadsworth
France	Lenroot	Poindexter	Watson

#### NAYS—27.

Beckham	Glass	Kirby	Ransdell
Chamberlain	Harrison	McKellar	Sheppard
Culberson	Henderson	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Dial	Hitchcock	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Fletcher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Trammell
Gay	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Wolcott
Gerry	Kendrick	Pomerene	

#### NOT VOTING—24.

Ashurst	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Swanson
Calder	La Follette	Robinson	Underwood
Dillingham	McCormick	Simmons	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	Walsh, Mont.
Harding	Newberry	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Harris	Overman	Stanley	Williams

So reservation No. 13 was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I now move to take up reservation No. 14, and to that I move an amendment which is printed on the slip, inserting at the beginning the lines in italics from 1 to 6 down to the words "United States." I will ask the Secretary to read it as it would stand as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts:

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the word "The," the first word, and insert:

Until part 1, being the covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate, shall be entitled to cast, the—

Then, after the word "the," in line 6, the following words intervene:

United States assumes no obligation to be bound—

Then, after the word "bound," in line 7, it is proposed to insert:

Except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent—

And, at the top of page 2, it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and insert "The United States," so that, if amended, the reservation will read:

Until part 1, being the covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate, shall be entitled to cast, the United States assumes no obligation to be bound, except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent, by any election, decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly in which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate, have cast more than one vote.

The United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly arising out of any dispute between the United States and any member of the league if such member, or any self-governing dominion, colony, empire, or part of empire united with it politically has voted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts to reservation No. 14.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not know whether the purpose of the amendment is to make the reservation more reasonable or whether it is merely to camouflage the situation for the purpose of indicating to the nations which we propose to disfranchise that we are doing it for a legitimate purpose.

The original reservation is nothing more nor less than a notice on the part of the United States that we object to having the self-governing dominions and colonies of the British Empire represented in the assembly. It is an attempt on our part to deny to those countries, which are practically independent nations, the right to a voice in international affairs.

Take, for instance, Canada, to the north of us. We practically say to Canada in this reservation, "We object to your being represented as a separate nation in the assembly of nations. We consent to all the little republics of the world being represented; we consent to each one of those little nations having a voice in the assembly; but we object to Canada, our neighbor on the north, being represented at all."

In other words, Mr. President, we are confronted with this situation: For years, as we know, there has been a steady purpose followed by the great colonies of the British Empire toward independence. Year by year they have taken over more of the powers of self-government, until to-day practically the only difference between Canada and an independent nation is that Great Britain, in the diplomacy of the world, represents Canada, and if the United States desires to negotiate a matter through diplomatic channels with Canada, we are supposed to take it up through the diplomatic representatives of the British Empire.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. SHIELDS. In view of the statement of the Senator, which is entirely sound, as I understand it, I should like to ask him a question.

The constitution of Canada is an act of Parliament, and its Government has only such powers as are given it by that act of Parliament. All of its foreign relations are conducted entirely through the British Imperial Government, the control of foreign relations being one of the prerogatives of the British Crown. Now, this treaty was signed more than a year ago. I wish to know, Has Great Britain within that time changed the constitutions of its self-governing colonies so as to allow them any control over their foreign relations? Has it taken any steps to execute this treaty, or has it still retained this power over the foreign relations of its colonies, which it always has had, and doubtless always will exercise?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am not much interested in knowing what progress has been made toward granting the demands of Canada and New Zealand and Australia and South Africa for an independent international status. I know very well, however, that the people of those dominions—largely Anglo-Saxons like ourselves—have set their hearts upon that

independent representation, and that they propose, as the result of this war, to secure that representation. I understand that Canada is also taking steps for representation with the United States and with other important nations of the world upon an independent basis; but I call the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the fact that in the face of this determined demand which was made at Paris by Canada and Australia and New Zealand and South Africa, in the United States, instead of lending encouragement to that determined effort to obtain diplomatic independence, the Senate of the United States proposes to slam the door of opportunity in the faces of these people, our neighbors here to the north.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I will ask if the Senator does not think that the authority to control the foreign relations of these self-governing colonies should come from the mother country, the Imperial Government, rather than the United States; and would it not be a very unfriendly act for the United States to be interfering in the affairs of the British Government and encouraging its colonies to exercise powers which the Imperial Government has never granted them, and which they can not exercise without an act of Parliament?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The United States, through the Senate, is attempting to interfere. The British Government at Paris was forced to yield to the demand of her colonies, and Great Britain wrote into this treaty her consent that they should be represented as independent nations in the assembly; and it is the reservationists of the Senate who are standing in the way of self-government, who are attempting to pull out of the fire the chestnuts of the British Empire, whose heads do not favor this growing independence of the colonies and dominions; and we are being placed in the attitude of refusing to our neighbor on the north and to the other colonies of the British Empire the right to independent representation. We are saying to them, in effect: "You have got to be represented by London. We will not consent to your independent representation. We will not consent to giving you a vote in the assembly independent of London. We will not consent to having you cast a vote contrary to the vote of the British Empire." That is unfortunately to be the attitude of the United States.

Mr. President, that is a splendid attitude to cultivate the friendship of our Canadian neighbor on the north, the neighbor with whom we have the chief business! Most of the business of Canada with the outside world is done with the United States. New York to-day is the financial center of Canada. Canada gets most of her imports from the United States and sends most of her exports to the United States. Immigration from the United States flows over into Canada, until to-day in Canada there are many men and women who were born in the United States, and we in the United States have hundreds of thousands of Canadians who sought their homes here and continue their relations there; and yet we propose to deny by this reservation to that great independent colony of Great Britain, that sacrificed in this war, as we did, tens of thousands of her men and millions of her money, the boon she asks of an independent representation in the assembly.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not recall that Sir Robert Borden in the Canadian House of Commons stated that the representative of the United States, among others, had resisted the demand of the Dominion for this representation?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, it is quite possible that the representative of the United States, foreseeing the petty struggle that would go on here by Senators quibbling over this and seeking to make capital out of it, realized that it would make the treaty more difficult to get through. He perhaps foresaw that Senators, like the Senator from Illinois and others, would rise here and claim that the United States had accorded to the British Empire six votes and that the United States had only one. He perhaps realized that it would make it harder to get through the Senate of the United States the giving of this boon to our neighbors. Nevertheless, I repeat that the United States should not take the position that it will refuse to our good neighbor on the north—our Anglo-Saxon neighbor on the north—the right to a separate vote in the assembly and will say to that neighbor, "You can only be represented by London in the affairs of this league."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator one more question. Does he recall the speech in the Canadian House of Commons of Mr. Fielding, for 16 years a minister of the Crown, in which he stated explicitly that logic was on the side of the contention of those in this country who insisted upon an equality of representation, in which he said that

New York was more important to this Republic than the Dominion to the Empire? Surely the Senator will recall that speech.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not see the significance in the remarks, if I do recall them, Mr. President. I know this: That the United States, if it enters the league, is going to be the most powerful member of it. I know that the United States, by reason of its tremendous influence with the 20 Republics in the western world, over a number of which it exercises an absolute protectorate, would be far more potent, even in the assembly of the League of Nations, than the British Empire if all the six dominions of the British Empire voted in solidarity. But I know very well that some of those votes of the British colonies will be much more likely, if a question arises, to take the view of the United States than to take the view of Great Britain.

Take the matter of immigration, for instance. Suppose immigration becomes a question before the League of Nations, and suppose in some way it gets into the assembly. How will Canada vote, if Canada has a vote? Canada holds exactly the same views that the United States holds on the subject of Asiatic immigration. Great Britain does not. Great Britain would like to have some of the Asiatics under her dominions permitted to come to the Western Hemisphere. Canada will not admit them. Canada refused Chinese immigration and Japanese immigration, and upon the subject of Asiatic immigration Canada holds exactly the same views that the United States holds. So does Australia, that great independent nation in the Southern Seas. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Nebraska has repeatedly stated that this reservation deprives Canada of a vote. Does he mean that?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator know that if the treaty is ratified with this reservation, Canada can not be deprived of a vote without her consent?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I mean, as a practical proposition, if we assert, in entering the league, and the other nations consent to it, that we will not submit to any election, judgment, decree, or finding by the assembly in which more than one vote is cast by the dominions of any empire, that that nullifies the election or decision, as far as we are concerned.

Mr. LENROOT. Who deprives her of the vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We do.

Mr. LENROOT. By what authority?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. By saying we will not submit to it.

Mr. LENROOT. By not being bound to it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes. In other words, if an election is held and Canada casts one vote, we say we will not be bound by it.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the Senator takes the position that if the United States is not bound by a certain act, the league will not act?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It could not. There could not be an election to which we refused to submit. Suppose there is an election and we refuse to submit to it. That voids the election.

Mr. LENROOT. How is that? Does the Senator mean to say that that voids the election?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It disrupts the league.

Mr. LENROOT. How?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If we refuse to recognize an election in which Canada has cast a vote, does it not void it?

Mr. LENROOT. Everyone else is bound except the United States. Is not that true?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; it is not true.

Mr. LENROOT. Why not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. You can not run a league with a disruption in the midst of it by the leading power in it. I am not going to quibble with the Senator. He offered the reservation for the purpose of preventing Canada from voting. He is in the attitude of disfranchising Canada, and so is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is in the attitude of standing here in this Chamber and seeking to disfranchise his neighbors upon the north, Canada, although tens of thousands of Canadians have come and settled within his State and are good citizens of New Hampshire. He is in the attitude of saying to them, "I will not permit the country from which you came, our neighbor on the north, our friendly neighbor, with whom we have been at peace for a hundred years, I will not permit that country of yours from which you came even to cast a single vote in the assembly of the League of Nations."

You are in that attitude, every one of you who votes for this reservation. You are in the attitude of slapping our good neighbor in the face. You are in the attitude of saying to



Canada, "We object to having you cast a single vote. We insist you shall remain under the dominion of the British Empire and permit the diplomatists from London to represent you in the League of Nations exclusively."

Mr. LENROOT and Mr. KELLOGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the Senator what his attitude is, then, toward India.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I can not make the same appeal for India that I can make for Canada. The people of India are separate and apart. I see no reason why India should have been accorded this vote. I suspect that the British Empire, forced to yield to the demands of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, probably thought it best to have India included also. I know of no other reason. Of course it is true that in India the demand for self-government and independence is growing. It is true that at the present time an agitation is in progress which will give to India, ultimately perhaps, a more or less complete system of self-government, and possibly that was included with a view to the day when India would have that self-government.

But the Senator dodges the issue. He can not say that Canada is not a self-governing dominion. He can not say that Canada is not practically an independent country. He can not say that Canada lacks our ideals or our high purpose. He knows, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] knows, that Canada has the same ideals that the United States has, the same standards that the United States has, a government very similar to the Government of the United States. There is no reason on earth why we should attempt to refuse to allow our Canadian neighbor on the north the right to a separate and independent vote in the assembly of the League of Nations, no reason why the United States should say to Canada, as you do say through this reservation, "We refuse you a right to a separate vote. You have to remain within the British Empire. You have to permit Great Britain to speak for you."

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. I understood the Senator to say that if immigration should become a subject for the council or the assembly, Canada would be more apt to vote with the United States than with Great Britain. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I expect you did.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator propose to make a treaty that gives the League of Nations control over immigration to this country?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then what was the object of the Senator's statement?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I just took it as an illustration, as one of the cases notoriously in which Canada agrees with the United States. There are many others. Her trade interests are practically the same as ours. Canada is a western country, the same as the United States is, has the same interests, the same surroundings, and the same necessities as the United States, and to a large extent is modeled in her industrial and political affairs on the United States, and is becoming more like the United States every day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would join with the Senator from Nebraska in any eulogy that he could deliver upon Canada. I do not think that imagination could conceive praise which would be higher than the Canadian people deserve for the heroism and the fortitude they exhibited in this great war; and I am willing to concede that the Canadian people are the equal of the people of the United States, man for man and woman for woman.

They are our brothers and our kindred, in a way. But what I object to is giving them six times as much influence in the League of Nations as we give to ourselves. My understanding of this compact is that it gives to the nation of which Canada is a part six votes in the assembly and gives to ourselves only one vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has a wrong impression.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I think not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It does not give the votes to the British Empire. There is just as much likelihood of Canada voting against London as there is of the United States voting against London. The votes of those colonies may be divided three on

one side and three on the other, and what I am pointing out to the Senator is that there is far more probability of the Canadian vote being cast with the vote of the United States than there is of its being cast with Great Britain, if the two differ. That is what I am pointing out, and the Senator insists all the time in treating them as a solidarity of votes, which is not true. There is a great deal more likelihood that there will be a solidarity of the votes between the United States and certain of the western Republics over which the United States exercises a protectorate than there is that there will be a solidarity of votes between the British Government and the Canadian Government and the other colonies.

The Senator knows that the vote of Panama, over which we exercise a sort of protectorate, and whose independence we guarantee, will always be with the United States. He knows that the vote of Cuba will always be with the United States. He knows that the vote of Haiti and the vote of Santo Domingo, over which we exercise protectorates, will always be with the United States; and he knows that the votes of other South and Central American countries which follow the United States, and which depend largely on our friendly support, will always be with the United States, and that fact constitutes the United States as the most powerful member of the league and she is ten times more apt to have those votes solidly behind her at all times on any question that comes up in the assembly than Great Britain is to have the votes of her colonies, because, Mr. President, it is well known that the colonies of Great Britain are constantly asserting and insisting on a larger measure of independence.

Differences have arisen between the mother country and her colonies and they long for a larger independence. Why? Not to agree with the mother country, but for the specific reason that they want to disagree with the mother country.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it can not be denied that Canada is a part of the British Empire. It is only one nation, the British Empire. Canada is simply a Province of the British Empire; and the British Empire, including Canada and the various other self-governing colonies which are given votes under this covenant, has six times the representation in the assembly of the League of Nations, according to this covenant, that we ourselves have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I deny it absolutely. I just denied it specifically.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I know the Senator denies it, and yet in denying it he denies the plain written words of this covenant, which gives 18 delegates—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This covenant does not say anything about the British Empire having 6 votes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It does say something about it having 6 votes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; nothing at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It gives them 6 votes in the assembly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It says that each self-governing colony shall have 1 vote, and if that vote is independent of the mother country it is not the British Empire vote; it is in one case a Canadian vote, in another an Australian vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator can not separate Canada from the British Empire by his declarations to the contrary. It is a part of the British Empire, and the repetition of the Senator that it is an independent nation can not change that fact.

If the Senator will permit me, I would like to take this occasion to differ with him in his assertion that the votes of the various Central and South American countries will always be cast with the United States. There is no such relation existing between the United States and South American countries as exists between Canada and the British Empire, and there is no reason for the United States to suppose that it can trust its fortunes in the future to the good will of Haiti or the good will of Panama or to any control we may have over them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have made that assertion, and I make it upon the strength of the relations which we exercise with Haiti and Santo Domingo. Those countries are under our protection at the present time. They are largely dependent upon the United States. We have guaranteed the independence of Cuba and Panama, and their foreign affairs are largely under the influence and control of the United States.

The Senator saw a demonstration of this during the war and saw how those countries and others of South America followed the United States; and so I say that in the League of Nations, against the assertion that the colonial vote of the self-governing colonies in the league will be under the control of the British

Empire, and even admitting that they should be, we would have a far greater strength in that same assembly by reason of those people of the small nations to the south of us.

I am glad to hear the Senator admit that as far as Canada is concerned he sympathizes with the statement that her people are as good as our people, and that her people are as much entitled to separate representation as we are. That is what it means.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not say that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is what it implies. I ask the Senator not to interrupt me any further.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will interrupt only to the extent of correcting the Senator's quotation of my remarks. I said they were as good, but not better.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As good. I would not say they were any better. Nobody would admit that; but they are our equals. They deserve as much credit for action in this war as we deserve. They suffered far more than we suffered. They have a Government as intelligent as ours and as high minded, and, as I said, they have our ideals and many of our institutions. It is not possible that self-respecting Americans want to say to Canada, to the millions of people in Canada, our neighbors to the north, "We refuse you the right to a voice in the assembly which is accorded to dozens of other smaller countries than you are, less advanced than you are, and less entitled to representation in the assembly than you are."

Mr. COLT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. COLT. I understood the Senator to say that Canada was an independent country. I hardly think that the Senator meant to use that term in a broad sense. I understand that the British Parliament is supreme over all her so-called independent dominions or colonies. I understand that Canada can not pass a law which is in conflict with any law passed by the Imperial Parliament. I understand that the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain can annul any law passed by the Canadian Parliament. I understand that the Parliament of Great Britain can repeal at once the Canadian constitution. In other words, I understand that the actual sovereign of the whole British Empire over its parts is the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain. I understand that especially the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain claims exclusive jurisdiction over all foreign affairs.

Therefore, while it is true generally that we speak of Canada as an independent dominion, because Great Britain permits her to have a large degree of independence, yet, in point of fact, the sovereign authority of the British Empire is the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, and it exercises absolute sovereignty over the entire British Empire.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am not so familiar probably with the organization of Canada as is the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. His service upon the bench has given him advantages which I have not had. But Canada is recognized in this instrument by Great Britain as a self-governing colony and dominion. Canada has been moving steadily in the direction of a greater and greater independence. The British Parliament may technically have the power to legislate for Canada, just as the King of England technically has the power to veto an act of Parliament, but as a matter of fact he never does, and as a matter of fact the British Parliament never exercises the power.

The British Government learned in its treatment of the thirteen American Colonies in 1776 a lesson which has served to aid Canada and Australia and New Zealand and South Africa in their constant progress toward independence, and year by year they have taken a larger share of independence to themselves, and the British Government has not resisted it.

So when it came to the formation of this treaty England was compelled to yield to Canada, yield to New Zealand, yield to Australia, yield to South Africa in the demands they made for a separate representation of their own in the assembly of the League of Nations. Now, after these colonies have compelled the mother country to grant them this increase of independence, shall it be the United States, through this reservation, that will attempt to slam the door in their faces? Shall it be the United States, that has been at peace for more than 100 years with Canada, that has cultivated the friendliest relations with Canada, that will say to Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa, "We deny to you a separate vote in the assembly?"

Mr. President, I hope not. I would rather see a complete collapse of this already badly damaged enterprise than to have the United States be the one to prevent the great progress

which these colonies are making toward becoming separate and independent countries. This is a great step, possibly not in the disintegration of the British Empire, but in the establishment of independence for the great colonies of the British Empire. We secured our independence quickly, and by war. They have been securing theirs gradually by evolution, but the ultimate independence is likely to be almost as complete in their case as it has become in ours.

I want to put into the RECORD a copy of a letter which came into my hands recently, written by Mr. J. C. Smuts, of the Union of South Africa, to a friend of his in the United States, as follows:

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA,  
Pretoria, January 19, 1920.

DEAR MR. GILDER: Thank you very much for your letter and the enclosed verses on "The Parting of the Ways," which had attracted my attention in some anthology. We are, indeed, all at the great parting of the ways in the history of civilization. At Paris a great battle for the soul of civilization was fought, and, in my opinion, won in that first chapter on the covenant of the League of Nations. That is the great creative word in favor of a new world order which has emerged from the noises of that conference.

America will understand all this yet and rally to the new banner under which the march of progress will be continued. When I read of our defeat in the Senate I thought of Walt Whitman's great lines:

"Have the elder races halted?  
Do they droop and end their lesson, wearied over there beyond the seas?  
We take up the task eternal, and the burden, and the lesson, Pioneers!  
O Pioneers!"

The irony is that America seems to be halting, while exhausted Europe is clutching at the ideal in her desolation and despair. But I feel sure this is only a passing mood, due to misunderstanding, and that America will yet be one of the firmest and strongest supports of the new order of things.

I regret deeply that the Senate has made such a dead set at the equality of voting power given to the young nations of the British Commonwealth. Why should America, who was once also a British colony, grudge us our entry into the great family of free States through the portals of the league? But here, too, I feel sure she will yet understand.

Always, yours, sincerely,

J. C. SMUTS.

Mr. REED. To whom is the letter addressed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Gilder.

Mr. REED. Who is he?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know.

Mr. REED. Is he an Englishman or an American?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know, and I do not care.

Mr. REED. I did not think the Senator cared.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, that letter expresses the idea. America, which ought to be the first to welcome Canada, the first to welcome Australia and the other self-governing colonies into a new family of independent nations, which ought to be the first to encourage them to take up the responsibility of independent international representation—America is the very one which seeks to deny to them what they have wrung from the Government of the British Empire.

It is not to be thought that the British Empire or the Government of the Empire views with approval the determination of Canada to have independent representation, but the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who sits over there and who is a neighbor of the Canadians, seeks to deny to Canada an independent voice in the assembly of the League of Nations. He and his colleague, neighbors of Canada, who ought to be in a position to know what Canada is and who Canadians are and what their ideals are and their institutions, step forward here in the Senate to refuse to Canada representation separate from the British Empire. He is forcing them back.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. Thanking the Senator from Nebraska for this unexpected tribute in singling me out, I wish to enter a total disclaimer of any of the motives which the Senator imputes to me. I have no opposition and no objection to Canada or any other part of the British Empire having 1 or 6 or 20 votes in the assembly of the League of Nations, but I do insist that the United States shall go into the League of Nations with as many votes as any other power there represented will have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes, Mr. President; that expresses it exactly. The Senator insists that Canada shall be treated simply as a subordinate part of the British Empire and denied independence.

Mr. MOSES. Is she anything else, Mr. President?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; Canada is an independent and self-governing country. This treaty accords to Canada independence in the assembly; it takes away from the British Empire the right and the power to represent Canada and gives that right to Canada herself; and the Senator from New Hampshire is proposing to deny it to Canada.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. May I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that if Canada is seeking independence she may follow the regular diplomatic course, as pursued by the soviet republic in Russia, for example, and send an ambassador to the United States seeking recognition. She does not have to do it through any indirect method such as the Senator from Nebraska sets up, nor is she doing it. If she has a vote in the League of Nations, she has it under the aegis of the British Empire, of which she is a part, and I have no desire to deprive her of that vote. I do, however, strenuously object to the United States taking a part in any organization where the British Empire is superior to us by reason of the votes of her dependencies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has already cast his vote in favor of a reservation which declares that the United States will not "be bound by any election, decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly in which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate, have cast more than one vote."

He thereby insists in that reservation that this country shall not be bound if any of the British colonies vote as well as the British Empire. That is denying to Canada the right to a separate vote, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, while the Senator from Nebraska shakes his fist at me, let me shake my finger at him, and say that if the Senator's record of votes upon all matters connected with this treaty had been as consistent as mine, he might well congratulate himself, for I, in the first instance, undertook, in cooperation with the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], to secure a direct amendment to the treaty which would give the United States equality of representation in the league; the Senator from Nebraska resisted it; and by means of the cooperation which he was able to secure from his side of the Chamber and from this the direct amendment, the only manful way of meeting the issue, was balked here in the Senate. Then, to be sure, Mr. President, I voted for the reservation, because there was no other course open if we were to assert in any sense the self-respect of the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am very glad to know, Mr. President, the reason why the Senator from New Hampshire voted for that reservation. I agree with him that his votes have been entirely consistent. He has practically voted for every amendment to the league covenant that has been offered which would have destroyed the league.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska must not say "practically." I voted for every amendment offered to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am glad to be accurate. I will say that the Senator voted for every amendment; every act of his has been in the direction of destroying the league.

Mr. MOSES. It has been in the direction, Mr. President, of rendering the treaty harmless to the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is the Senator's reason, but, as a matter of fact, he has voted for every amendment which would kill the league; every amendment which the Senate rejected because it would kill the league, for a majority did not want to kill it; and the Senator voted for every reservation to nullify the league. So he voted for the reservation which proposed to deny to Canada and the self-governing colonies of the British Empire the right to escape from the control of the British Empire and to cast their own votes to suit themselves. I have not misrepresented the Senator from New Hampshire; I know what he has done; and I singled him out because he had been consistent.

Mr. MOSES. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for this further tribute, Mr. President.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I am jealous of the distinction. I think I also deserve the glorious opprobrium as well. I have sought it like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] sitting here, and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]; and there are others of us who are engaged in the same enterprise.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I presume that this reservation will carry, as it carried before, but I wish to take this occasion to file my protest, as an American, against the act of the United States in attempting to refuse to the self-governing colonies of the British Empire an opportunity to become free and independent nations in a greater degree than they now are. It is well known that their constant aspirations in recent years have been in the direction of independence; and at Paris they wrung from the British Empire and from the remainder of the world there represented recognition as being independent, partially at least, and entitled to be represented in the assembly.

If the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators want to deny that right to Canada, let them do so.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am sure the lexicographers will be grateful to the Senator from Nebraska for the new interpretation which he has put upon the word "American."

Mr. McCORMICK. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gore	McKellar	Simmons
Beckham	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hale	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Harris	Moses	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	Myers	Spencer
Chamberlain	Henderson	Nelson	Sterling
Colt	Hitchcock	New	Sutherland
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Townsend
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Page	Trammell
Edge	Kellogg	Phelan	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kendrick	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Keyes	Polindexter	Warren
Fletcher	King	Pomerene	Watson
France	Kirby	Ransdell	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Reed	Wolcott
Gay	Lenroot	Sheppard	
Gerry	Lodge	Sherman	
Glass	McCormick	Shields	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if during the many months that the Senate has had under consideration the pending treaty the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] had shown half as much concern for the interests of the United States as he has this afternoon shown for the interests of Canada and the British Empire the treaty would have been ratified long ago, with proper Americanizing reservations.

Mr. President, I thought, as the Senator was speaking, that there must be many in the galleries this afternoon who imagined themselves sitting not in the gallery of the Senate of the United States but in the gallery of the Canadian House of Parliament or the British House of Commons. I am very sorry that the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska is more pro-British and less American than is the attitude of Lord Grey and the British foreign office, as I shall hereafter show. But, Mr. President, the attitude of the Senator from Nebraska was not always thus. Until this new world had been created in his imagination we never heard the Senator from Nebraska defending British diplomacy or the British Empire; and, in view of the statements he has made, I think I am justified in quoting to the Senate very briefly the views of the Senator from Nebraska upon the arbitration treaty before the Senate in 1912. I wish to say to the Senator that he can show nothing that occurred at the peace conference at Paris, nor anything that has intervened since the war, with regard to British diplomacy to indicate that there has been during that time any change in the character of British diplomacy from what it was in 1912.

This is what the Senator from Nebraska said in this body on January 4, 1912, speaking of the arbitration treaty with Great Britain then pending:

Mr. President, anyone looking into the future, I believe, must admit that if this treaty, as it comes to us, is ratified by the Senate and goes into effect, Great Britain will have ten times the number of demands upon us for arbitration of questions in which she is interested as the proponent that we will have upon her.

And I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska, if that was true then, is it not equally true to-day?

That is the natural course of events. Her interests are such, her policies are such, that she will be constantly seeking to restrain us and interfere with the American policies of this country.

And yet the Senator from Nebraska stands upon this floor and opposes a reservation that will prevent the British Empire from using her power to do those things which the Senator from Nebraska said the British Empire surely would do, if she had the opportunity, against the interests of this country.

He goes on:

For that reason I think this country would be unwise to put itself, by an ironclad and practically unlimited treaty, in the position of promising to submit everything to arbitration that is justiciable, and then to leave the question of justiciability to a mixed commission, whose three American members are appointed by the President and responsible only to him. The interests of the country will be safer in the care of the Senate, and its restraint on the President should be maintained as provided in the Constitution.

Those were the views of the Senator from Nebraska then. Those were the views of the Senator when he was standing upon the floor of the Senate speaking as an American. He is speaking to-day not as an American but as an internationalist—

no, not even as an internationalist, because an internationalist at all times would endeavor to see that the country from which he comes has at least equality of treatment, and he pleads here to-day for inequality against his own country in favor of a foreign nation!

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. MOSES. In connection with the manner in which the Senator from Nebraska has so constantly inveighed against Senators upon this side of the Chamber, I trust the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me to add to what he has already said the fact that the treaty which the Senator from Nebraska at that time opposed was one negotiated by a Republican President.

Mr. LENROOT. It was; and it did not propose or pretend to entail upon the United States any obligations comparable to the obligations which the Senator from Nebraska now wants the United States to assume under this peace treaty.

Just one further little quotation from the Senator's speech, made upon the same occasion. He said:

I think if we look over the history of the United States in recent years we will conclude that we are in more danger from the diplomats of Great Britain than we are from her dreadnoughts.

Yet to-day he is asking to increase the diplomatic power of the British Empire to a point where it will be six times greater than was the diplomatic power in this treaty which he then fought because of its being, as he said, inimical to American interests!

Mr. President, it is difficult to speak temperately in attempting to reply to the Senator from Nebraska, when one knows the attitude that he took only a short time ago, comparatively speaking.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska used as an illustration where the vote of Canada might be with the United States, and against Great Britain, the question of immigration. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] asked him a question as to whether he was in favor of submitting questions of immigration to the League of Nations. He said "no"; but nevertheless the Record shows that the Senator from Nebraska has voted against the reservations that have been adopted to this treaty precluding the League of Nations from taking under its jurisdiction any question of immigration or like domestic questions.

The Senator from Nebraska and his colleagues, by voting against that reservation, have taken the position that they desired to have the League of Nations determine whether a question is domestic or not; and if it determines that it is not, even though it does involve immigration, even though it does involve policies upon which the very existence of this Republic depends, the Senator from Nebraska and his associates nevertheless have voted to place those matters under the jurisdiction of the League of Nations. So the Senator was entirely correct in using the question of immigration as one that the League of Nations might consider and determine, and in saying that in that event that Canada might vote with the United States. But the Senator from Nebraska must know that, thanks not to him, but to those upon this side of the aisle, this treaty will never be ratified with any jurisdiction in the League of Nations to determine questions of immigration or any other like question for the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska read a very touching letter from Gen. Smuts, and a poem, and he referred most feelingly to the fact that the United States was once a colony, and that we should be tender of the colonies that now exist belonging to Great Britain. I agree; and Mr. President, if Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, or any of their colonies would secure their independence and freedom as the United States did, the United States would be the first to extend a welcome hand to them whenever they had secured their independence. This reservation, as I shall show in a moment, does not in the slightest degree affect the right of any of these colonies to vote; but, nevertheless, the fact is that what the Senator from Nebraska is pleading for is that these colonies, through their representatives, shall have all the rights of a free and independent nation, and have the power to impose obligations upon us, and at the same time have all of the privileges of a subject nation, because that is the international relationship of Canada and the British colonies. It has never been better stated than in the letter of Lord Grey to the London Times, and let me quote from it:

The self-governing dominions are full members of the league. They will admit, and Great Britain can admit, no qualification whatever of that right. Whatever the self-governing dominions may be in theory and in the letter of the constitution, they have, in effect, ceased to be

colonies in the old sense of the word. They are free communities, independent as regards all their own affairs, and partners in those which concern the empire at large.

Mark the words, "partners in those which concern the empire at large." Now, that is an extreme statement, of course, because up to this good hour, at least, neither Canada nor Australia nor any other of the British colonies has ever pretended to have a full partnership, an equal voice, with Great Britain in the settlement of foreign policies. But, granting that this is true, what are they in regard to international matters, in matters affecting the British Empire as a whole? Independent? Separate? No; Lord Grey does not say that. The Senator from Nebraska does, but Lord Grey does not make any such claim. He says they are partners. What does a partnership mean? A partnership means an interest and concern for each member of the partnership in the business as a whole. A partnership means that in all matters coming before the League of Nations Canada will not act as an independent nation, but as a partner, one of the partners of the British Empire; and, being one of the partners of the British Empire, of course the interests of the British Empire will be its first concern.

We, therefore, are put in this position: The United States goes into a partnership with many partners, and one of her partners says: "Here, I have a partnership of my own, a partnership within a partnership, and we insist that each one of my partners shall have as many votes as any one of our other partners"; and in the particular case we have here the British Empire insists that she, having five partners, shall have six votes to one of each of the other partners.

Is there anyone who would say that that was a fair arrangement; that that was an arrangement that any American Senator, whether he might apologize for it or not, could advocate as the Senator from Nebraska has done? Why, of course not; and if something had not happened to the Senator from Nebraska in the consideration of this matter, whether it be blindly following President Wilson or what it may be, if he had had the same viewpoint that he had a few years ago, the Senator from Nebraska never would be heard advocating any such proposition as he now advocates.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. GORE. I want to ask the Senator if the speech referred to as having been made by the Senator from Nebraska some time ago was made before the Senator was overcome by the spirit of the new magic, before he was dazzled by the new vision upon the horizon, before he was enchanted by the new siren voices in the air?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; that was before we had a new order of things. That was before British diplomacy had been entirely regenerated.

But the Senator from Nebraska says that this reservation is unfair to Canada. Let us see. In adopting this reservation we are most generous to Canada and to each one of the colonies. The United States might well object to any of the colonies having any voice or representation of any character in the League of Nations. But the United States has not done so. This reservation does not do so. No one has proposed to deny to Canada or any other colony a vote in the League of Nations, and this reservation does not do so, nor purport to do so. If this reservation is adopted and the peace treaty ratified, Canada can not be deprived of a vote in the League of Nations upon any matter without her own consent.

The reservation merely states that in any case, if these votes are exercised, the United States is not bound by the decision thus made. But Canada can go on, nevertheless, and insist upon her right to vote.

Then what is the difficulty, and what is the objection of Canada? I think I know, Mr. President. It is very evident to me that Canada fears that if this reservation be adopted, Great Britain will so coerce her that she will not exercise the right to vote that is given her in a given case in order that the United States may be bound. And if that be true, Mr. President, it furnishes one of the strongest reasons for the adoption of this reservation, because if Canada feels that Britain could so coerce her as to have her yield up the right to vote in a given case, it is equally apparent that the same method of coercion upon any question that comes before the league would enable the British Foreign Office to command the vote of the representatives of the colonies in any way that they saw fit.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.



Mr. McCORMICK. May I interrupt the Senator to remind him that at the conclusion of the labor congress which met in Washington under the terms of the treaty delegates from continental Europe bitterly complained that Mr. Barnes, at the head of the labor delegation from Great Britain, delivered all the votes of the delegates from the component parts of the British Empire?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I rise merely to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that this is not a new trait in British diplomacy. In 1912, when we had the wireless international convention, Russia raised objection to the numerous votes that Great Britain claimed, and the United States backed Russia in the proposition. I happen to know whereof I am speaking, because I represented the United States in that diplomatic action. The United States then and there claimed equal voting power with Great Britain, and the treaty itself shows that the United States received equal voting power with Great Britain, and that we took over votes for Hawaii, Alaska, the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and the Panama Canal Zone, thus equalizing the vote.

Mr. LENROOT. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Upon the question whether we do attempt to deprive Canada or the colonies of the vote, I again wish to quote from the letter of Lord Grey. He said:

It may be sufficient to observe that the reservation of America does not in any way challenge the right of the self-governing dominions to exercise their votes.

Of course, the Senator from Nebraska says that it does. The Senator from Nebraska is asking more for the British Empire than Lord Grey is. The Senator from Nebraska says that this reservation deprives Canada of rights which Lord Grey says it does not deprive Canada of.

Mr. President, I have read a good many speeches during the past two or three weeks of Canadian statesmen upon this fourteenth reservation but there is not one of them that pleads so zealously for the interests of Canada as I heard the Senator from Nebraska plead this afternoon.

Lord Grey goes on—

Nor does it state that the United States will necessarily reject a decision in which those votes have been cast. It is therefore possible—I think it is even more than probable—that in practice no dispute will ever arise. Our object is to maintain the status of the self-governing dominions, not to secure a greater British than American vote, and we have no objection in principle to an increase of the American vote.

Mr. President, the amendment that is now pending, the change in the reservation that is made in the reservation previously adopted, provides that until the United States is given an equal number of votes by amendment of the league covenant, with these other nations, we assume no obligation to be bound by their decisions, but any time they want to bind us, we point the way. If they amend the League of Nations, giving to the United States equality with the British Empire, we would be bound. But why any American, Mr. President, should object to this reservation when Lord Grey does not object to it is beyond my comprehension.

But, after all, Mr. President, is not that the reason and does it not explain the entire difficulty concerning this peace treaty? Oh, Mr. President, if Senators of the United States, all of them, were as anxious to protect the interests of America as they are to protect the interests of some foreign country we would not have any difficulty in getting together upon reservations to this treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator seems to be surprised that Lord Grey was so ready to concede the reservation which disfranchises Canada.

Mr. LENROOT. No; Lord Grey said it does not disfranchise Canada. The Senator from Nebraska says it does.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have already explained to the Senator that the British Government did not want to accord the vote to Canada, to Australia, nor to the other colonies. We ought to encourage those colonies in their work of becoming independent, not discourage them.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Nebraska has stated that Great Britain strenuously objected to their having a vote, but I have seen no evidence of that fact, and I do not think the Senator from Nebraska up to to-day has ever sought to produce any evidence substantiating the statement which he has just made.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I find myself in some difficulty in following the reasoning of the Senator from Nebraska. With great vigor he insists that the United States shall take an obligation to preserve the territorial integrity and to maintain the political independence of members of the league, and now he urges us by some subterfuge or by some underhand or indirect method to take steps which will encourage the colonies of the British Empire to throw off the yoke of the mother country. Which road does he intend to follow? Does he wish us to enter into this league and to ratify this treaty for the purpose of protecting the territorial integrity and political independence of members of the league, or does he wish us to take it just as it came from the hands of the master workmen at Versailles for the purpose of undermining the British Empire and lopping off its colonial members?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I do not think it is difficult for any Senator to follow the road along which the Senator from Nebraska would lead the Senate. It has been apparent for a long time that the road he is following leads to straight rejection, and I can see no purpose in the speech of the Senator from Nebraska this afternoon except to make trouble with Canada and arouse Canadian feeling against this treaty if it should be deposited at Geneva. The Senator's speech could have no other purpose. Has the Senator ever said that this equality of voting was the heart of the league? Has his chief ever said that? Does the Senator take the position—and he has said it this afternoon—that he would rather see this entire treaty collapse than to have this inequality remedied? Is that the Senator's position, in spite of hours and hours and hours of speeches that he has made here upon the Senate floor?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, the Senator knows that is not my position.

Mr. LENROOT. I have the Senator's words, that "I would rather see a complete collapse."

Mr. McCORMICK. "Of the enterprise."

Mr. LENROOT. "Of the enterprise." Those were the Senator's words.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; than to see the United States take the position of denying the independence of these colonies.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I say it is to the interest of the United States to encourage them in their effort to become independent.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, we have the Senator from Nebraska where there can be no misunderstanding. He would rather see this treaty fall than to have the United States take a position that would discourage the independence of the British colonies. That is what he has just said. If that be true, what is the value of this treaty? Is the heart and purpose of this treaty to encourage the Dominion of Canada to revolt? I had supposed that the purpose of this treaty was to maintain the peace of the world. I had supposed that he and his chief, the President, believed the heart of the treaty was in the arbitration articles and article 10. But now we have the Senator from Nebraska saying that the treaty might as well go to the scrap heap unless we take care that the British Empire has six votes to the United States one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator knows very well that my position is that with this reservation attached the treaty is already in the scrap heap, and it has not anything like the value it had when it came to the Senate. It is an entirely different proposition. It has been nullified and ruined by these reservations.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, the Senator says, first, that it is in the scrap heap by having these reservations attached, and then that it has not anything like the value that it had before the reservations were adopted. I can not follow the Senator from Nebraska. Does he mean to say that it was almost in the scrap heap when it was presented to us and had very little value? Because he says it has nothing like the value that it then had, or it would be in the scrap heap.

Mr. McCORMICK. There would be some Democrats in the same position as the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I think that is true, and I think we all understand that the Senator from Nebraska has had a most tortuous road to follow and a most difficult task to perform. But I am very sure that if the Senator does not correct the statement that he just made, he will be sorry in the future to be faced with the statement that he would rather see this entire treaty fail than to have the British Empire deprived of the right to bind the United States by a vote of 6 to 1.

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator has overestimated the difficulties of the Senator from Nebraska. It seems to me that anyone occupies a most comfortable situation who can every morning say: "Give us this day our daily thoughts," and have perfect confidence that the prayer will be granted. [Laughter.]



Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, it has become the fashion in some quarters to attribute to Senators who hold that the United States must have as many votes as the British Empire an incurable hostility to the Empire and to England. Nothing that has been said by any of us who have insisted upon securing for the United States as many votes as those accorded to any other member of the league can be construed either as seeking to deny to the British self-governing dominions the voice which they would have or as underestimating the heroic sacrifices of the peoples of the British Empire in the Great War. Those of us who have been along the blasted fronts were the first among Senators to pay tribute to the resolution and the imperishable courage of the armies raised in England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, the self-governing dominions, and even in India.

It is we, sir, I think, who have fully appreciated the true greatness of the British Empire and who are most ready to bear witness not only to the courage but the genius of the English. Conquerors and governors in every quarter of the world, merchants and mariners since the dawn of modern history, great lawgivers, astute diplomats! The evidence of their genius in the conduct of foreign affairs is to be found in the measure which was laid before the Senate by the chief representative of the United States, who returned defeated and not knowing it.

It would be well if Senators who desire to join in the ratification of this compact would spend more time in the study of historic facts and less in the composition of mellifluous phrases. In the consideration of the reservation now before the Senate and of the provisions of the covenant with which it would deal it would be profitable if there were more study of the anomalous constitution of the British Empire under which, as Lord Grey has said, the dominions are becoming independent in the conduct of their domestic affairs while they remain "partners," to use his term, in the conduct of foreign affairs. There, sir, is the precise distinction. I trust that some Senators on the other side of the aisle who are jealous of the interests of the United States will remind the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that only the other day a case involving the validity of a statute of the Province of Saskatchewan in the course of appeal finally reached the Privy Council in London, and there, by the legal committee of that Privy Council, was set aside as in violation of the British North America act, which is the constitution of the Dominion. My friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McCORMICK. Will bear me out that in the ordinary course of affairs, during a long period and until this time, appeals have been taken to the Privy Council in London. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to call his attention to the fact that when we speak of the constitution of Canada, employing that term in the sense we use the word "constitution" in the United States, it is a misnomer. In our Constitution it is declared that all powers are vested in the people, and the people in the manner and form laid down can change their Constitution, because they are the source of authority, and our Constitution is a bill really of limitation upon the powers of government, whereas this act of the British Parliament, which is referred to as the constitution, is nothing but a concession of powers by the Imperial Government to a colony, powers which it can grant and powers which it can take away. It is, therefore, in no sense a constitution such as we possess, but it is a mere privilege exercised by the grace of the Crown and revocable at the pleasure of the Imperial Government of the Empire.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Missouri will remember that I referred to the so-called constitution of the Dominion as the British North America act.

Mr. REED. I am not criticizing the Senator.

Mr. McCORMICK. It is thus that in Canada reference is made to it in law and in the vernacular. I was not addressing myself to the legal character of the instrument under which Canada is governed, but to the current practice, because the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] referred to the practice, to the evolution of independence.

Let me suggest that it would be well to follow current history to determine how far that evolution has advanced. It was only the other day that one of the ministers of the Crown of Canada, Mr. Meighan, in addressing a Canadian audience upon this very resolution now before the Senate, said that the Dominion Government had made representations to the foreign office in London and asked Downing Street to communicate through the British Embassy in Washington with the Government of the United States. Perhaps those representations were made before the appointment of his British Majesty's ambassador to Washington had

been gazetted. Since Mr. Meighan spoke we have read that Sir Auckland Geddes, described in the dispatches as a Canadian, has been appointed British ambassador in Washington and that in order to accept that appointment he resigned the presidency of McGill University in Quebec.

Mr. President, in order to get more light on this anomalous situation I have sought the debates in the several Parliaments of the several Dominions upon the ratification of the treaty. Sir Robert Borden alluded to the British Empire as a league within a league. Gen. Smuts, to whom reference has been made on the floor of the Senate to-day, used precisely the same language. He asserted during the course of debate that the British Empire was a union, perpetual and indivisible. In answer to the contention of the small minority in South Africa he spoke in terms which might have been put in the mouths of Webster and his fellows in the Senate. He spoke of the whole Empire, including the Dominions, in terms exactly analogous to those in which during the great days of the Senate Daniel Webster and those who shared his views spoke of the union.

The view of a league within the league held in South Africa and Canada is shared, as far as I can learn, by the political leaders of Australia. In New Zealand there is a grave divergence of opinion.

Whatever may be said upon the abstract merits of according a vote to the Dominions, or whatever may be said of their prospective union with America in the assembly, not even the Senator from Nebraska has ventured to defend, as did the President, the gift of a vote to the Empire of India. That vote will be nominated by the British India office, but it must be cast, as every vote of the British Empire must be cast, with a view to the public opinion of India, in so far as it may be articulate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] on Saturday spoke eloquently against the Turks remaining in Constantinople. We know that Mr. Lloyd-George has palliated, defended, excused the continuance of the Turk in Constantinople because of demands therefor by the 60,000,000 or 70,000,000 Mohammedans in India.

That is a vote which very definitely falls in the same category as those of the four American States to which the Senator from Nebraska referred. But I make bold to add that for each of the four American States asserted to be under the protectorate of the United States there are four European or Asiatic States under the protectorate of the British Empire. For Haiti there is Siam. For Santo Domingo there is the Hedjaz. For Panama there is Portugal. For Cuba there is Persia.

If it come to the pursuit of votes, the advantage which we may have in the Americas will find its counterpart in the advantage which the British will have among the new and weak States on the Baltic and in central Europe. A few years hence it will defy belief to assert that Senators stood upon this floor to defend the proposition that the British Empire should be accorded six votes to one vote for the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator correctly stated that the entire foreign relations of Canada were in the hands of the British Government. He might have gone further and said that the executive power in Canada is vested in the governor general of Canada, who is appointed by the King, and in the Privy Council; and that, furthermore, under certain provisions of the British North America act the King or Queen of Great Britain reserves a veto power. So, to say that Canada is entirely independent, as much so as is the United States, is to show a surprising ignorance about the organization of the Canadian Government.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the pending reservation is very little more to my liking than it is to that of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I have been constrained to vote for it only because the Senate, shrinking from its duty, as I think, has failed by amendment of the treaty or by reservation to provide explicitly that as a condition of our adhesion to the treaty and the covenant as many votes shall be accorded the United States as are accorded the British Empire.

There are Senators who have felt less strongly on this score than have I; Senators have justified their support of the reservation introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH] on the ground that to go further would make impossible the present ratification of the treaty and the present acceptance by the United States of the conditions of the covenant. Since the issue has been presented to the Senate the second time, I have sought to meet the legitimate American demand for an equality of votes, without arousing the apprehensions of some of my



colleagues, by preparing an amendment to the reservation now before us, which reads as follows:

Unless within one year after the filing of this act of ratification part 1, being the covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate, shall be entitled to cast, the United States shall cease to be a member of the League of Nations.

Nothing therein prejudices the ratification of the treaty, but provision is made that unless within one year after the act of ratification is filed in Paris the covenant of the league be amended to accord to the United States as many votes as are accorded to the British Empire we shall withdraw.

There are Senators more royalist than the King, more jealous of the interests of the British Empire and its advantage than is Lord Grey, less respectful of the public opinion and the legitimate rights of the people of the United States than he has been. Sir, as has been said before in this Chamber, no matter what the action of the Senate may be the issue of the equal vote can not down, and Senators who to-day or to-morrow vote against an equality of votes for the United States will find themselves going hither and yon upon the hustings and upon the stump seeking to explain and explain again how it was that they were less zealous for American rights than was Lord Grey of Falldon.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, so much has been said in reply to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and so well said, that the remarks I had intended to make are largely unnecessary. However, I can not refrain from calling attention to two or three strange contrarieties of position which the Senator occupies.

On Friday, I believe it was, possibly on Thursday, of last week the Senator from Nebraska grew eloquent in declaring that the British Empire was a democracy more responsive to public opinion than the Government of the United States. To-day he tears passion to tatters as he proclaims that above everything else he desires to release Canada from the thrall of the British Empire. One day the British Empire is the greatest and the purest democracy of earth; the next day Canada is bound in the galling chains of servitude by a great Empire from which she vainly struggles for release.

If the British Empire is what the Senator said it was on Thursday or Friday, then, instead of seeking to dismember it and to deprive its citizens of the beneficence of its democratic government, he ought to be urging that we should do nothing tending in the least to lessen the allegiance of any of its colonies. When it suits the Senator from Nebraska to regard the British Empire as a great central power dominating unwilling subjects, he takes that position; when it suits him to declare it is the greatest democracy on earth, he assumes that attitude; and so, as I stated the other day, referring to the parable from Aesop, he runs upon one set of legs when it suits him, and when he can not employ them without a blush he whirls over and runs upon the other set of legs.

It has been said that a man can not ride two horses going in opposite directions at the same time, but the Senator from Nebraska has broken all precedents and has denied all rules, for he, at least, can go in two different directions at the same moment without embarrassment.

Mr. President, if the British Empire is the greatest democracy on earth, more responsive to the will of its people than any other country on earth, why is it that the Senator wants to take Canada from under the British flag? Why does he want to encourage Canada to renounce her allegiance to the mother country? Why in one breath is he demanding that we shall pledge the life and the blood of our sons to preserve the territorial integrity of the British Empire, and in the next instant that the Senate shall take action which will encourage the dismemberment of the British Empire? The jewel of consistency does not adorn the escutcheon of Nebraska's senior Senator.

The Senator has declared that the League of Nations "is necessary to preserve the civilization of the world." He tells us unless we adopt it "the world will again be soaked in blood of millions," "all its hills and valleys will be white with the bones of the slain," "chaos will rule," and "the foot of tyranny will rest upon the breasts" of the few survivors of the human race. All this is to come to us if we do not have the League of Nations; and yet the Senator states that he would rather have the entire League of Nations fail than to deprive Canada of the right to a vote in the League of Nations. One position or the other is absurd; the two can not stand together. If the League of Nations means to the world a thousandth part of what its advocates assert it means, then the question whether Canada shall or shall not vote in the league ought not to result in its destruction or abandonment. Likewise a dispute over

the rights of Fiume, a city containing 50,000 Italians, should not be permitted to wreck the world, to drive humanity to terrible and destructive wars, and to hurl civilization into the very chasm of destruction.

Mr. President, let us examine the question that is now presented. It is not proposed to deprive Canada of a vote, although, as I shall show in a few moments, she is not entitled to a vote, because she is not an independent nation, neither is she a free moral agent in the councils of the world. What is proposed? That we shall take Lord Grey at his word; and, although his words have been referred to, I want to read them into the Record literally:

Our object is to maintain the status of the self-governing dominions, not to secure a greater British than American vote, and we have no objection in principle to an increase of the American vote.

Here stands Lord Grey proclaiming to all the world that the Empire is willing the United States shall have as many votes in the League of Nations as the British Empire, including its colonies. With that statement from an eminent British statesman, who speaks beyond question for his Government, we find an American Senator protesting against America possessing that equality which Great Britain states America is entitled to have!

You may ransack the annals of American history and you will not find an instance where an American statesman has taken a position so un-American and so pro-British.

Mr. President, much eulogy has been passed upon the people of Canada. They are our neighbors. They are more like us than any other people in the world. They are gallant in war and efficient in the arts of peace; a splendid people; but I refuse to consider the Canadian people, as a whole, the equals of the people of the United States. If they loved liberty as we do, assuming that the people of the United States are like the old red-blooded Americans of the past, they would not stay under the British flag. They would assert and obtain their independence. That is for them to determine. They have seen fit to remain a part of Great Britain; and I affirm now that according to every line of their written history they are as loyal to the British flag and to the Government of the Empire as the most loyal citizen of London. So that when we come to consider them, without the slightest reflection upon them, we must remember that fundamentally they are Britishers.

Let me call attention again to another proposition. There are only 65,000,000 Britishers in the whole world. Approximately 42,000,000 of them reside in England, Scotland, and Wales; the rest of them are distributed among the various colonies and dependencies of Great Britain, or scattered throughout the world. Sixty-five million Britishers control and dominate the entire British Empire. That 65,000,000 Britishers, under this pact as now drawn, will cast six votes in the League of Nations, and 110,000,000 American citizens will cast one. It is proposed by the Senator who assumes to speak for the President that we shall refuse to take an equality of voting when Great Britain stands tendering it to us!

I should like to hear the Senator from Nebraska defend that proposition in his own State.

Why, Canada has 2,000,000 less people than the State of New York alone, counting all of their population; and quite a considerable portion of that population speaks the French language, and was so averse to the support of this war that the draft was made necessary in Canada in order to force them into the service.

Would there be any incongruity in providing that the United States shall have as many representatives in the League of Nations as the British Empire, including her colonies, in view of the fact that Lord Grey concedes that we are entitled to as many votes? Would there be any difficulty in writing into this treaty a single word, changing the word "one" to the word "six" where it applies to the United States? Is that an insurmountable obstacle? Does the Senator from Nebraska think there is a page in the Senate who could not take the document and make that change? And does the Senator from Nebraska imagine that our representatives would be rejected if they were to go to the new capital of the world to lay the honor and the sovereignty of the United States at the feet of the new world government?

Mr. President, let me for a moment inquire as to what is the real status of Canada with reference to the Imperial Government of the Empire.

I recognize the temerity involved in undertaking to discuss the laws of a foreign country. We are all under a handicap when we try to speak of the government of another country than our own. I have only been able to make a hasty examination of the Canadian act. Nevertheless I venture to assert that Canada does not possess a constitution in the sense we use that word;

that she never has had a constitution; that every right the Canadian people possess is a grant of grace, revocable at the pleasure of the Imperial Government of the Empire.

Repeating what I said a few moments ago, the so-called constitution of Canada bears no resemblance whatsoever to the American Constitution. When our fathers declared the liberties of this people they asserted that all just government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. They affirmed that every human right is vested in the people themselves, and that no power of government exists save that which is granted by the people who create and set up.

This people, the source of all power and of all authority, saw fit then to write a Constitution—for what purpose? Chiefly to prescribe and limit the powers the agents they appointed to exercise the functions of government might assume. They prescribed, first, just what powers those agents might exercise. They prescribed, second, certain powers that they could under no circumstances assume to exercise. They reserved to the several States and the people thereof all other powers not expressly granted to the Federal Government, and they provided that this Constitution of limitation and of grant could be by the people of the United States at any time revoked, altered, amended, or changed as the people saw fit, in the manner and form the people themselves had prescribed. That is a Constitution of the people. It is a Constitution that springs from the people and is always under the control of the people.

But what of this so-called constitution of Canada? To begin with, every Britisher is a subject, not a sovereign; not an independent man, but a subject, born in the condition of subjection. He possesses no rights that the British Parliament, in connection with the British Crown, can not take away whenever they see fit to take them away. The source of authority, therefore, is found in the British Parliament and in the Crown of Great Britain. That source of authority saw fit to grant to Canada certain rights. The power to grant always carries with it the power to withdraw. The sovereignty is yonder in the Imperial Government. That sovereignty has merely granted to Canada as of grace certain privileges. That same sovereign power can at any moment be exercised to take from Canada every right it has granted. The Imperial Government is supreme.

So that the so-called constitution is not a constitution at all. The people of Canada can not change it, the people of Canada can not annul it, the people of Canada can not amend it, the people of Canada can do nothing whatsoever with it. They can exercise certain privileges granted to them as of grace, and no more. When they come to exercise those rights, as I shall show you, they do so subject to the supreme power of the sovereignty, and that sovereignty is in England, not in Canada.

I have taken the pains to get the Canadian act and desire briefly to call attention to its terms. It reads:

Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom—

An unwritten constitution, changeable by the Parliament of England at any time.

And whereas such a union would conduce to the welfare of the Provinces—

And so forth.

Be it therefore enacted and declared by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

This act may be cited as the *British North America act, 1867*.

The provisions of this act referring to Her Majesty the Queen extend also to the heirs and successors of Her Majesty, Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honorable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this act, the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick shall form and be one dominion, under the name of Canada; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one dominion under that name accordingly.

I am omitting parts. Now, mark this:

*The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.*

Mr. GORE. Read that again.

Mr. REED. It says:

*The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.*

The provisions of this act referring to the governor general extend and apply to the governor general for the time being of Canada, or other chief executive officer or administrator for the time being carried on the Government of Canada on behalf and in the name of the Queen, by whatever title he is designated.

There shall be a council to aid and advise in the Government of Canada, to be styled the *Queen's Privy Council for Canada*; and the persons who are to be members of that council shall be from time to time

chosen and summoned by the Governor General and sworn in as privy councillors, and members thereof may be from time to time removed by the Governor General.

All powers, authorities, and functions which under any act of Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the Legislature of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Canada, Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick are at the union vested in or exercisable by the respective governors or lieutenant governors of those Provinces, with the advice, or with the advice and consent of the respective executive councils thereof, or in conjunction with those councils, or with any member or members thereof, or by those governors or lieutenant governors individually, shall, as far as the same continue in existence and capable of being exercised after the union in relation to the Government of Canada, be vested in and exercisable by the Governor General, with the advice or with the advice and consent of or in conjunction with the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, etc.

Reading now from paragraph 14 of the third division or article, and abbreviating, it proceeds:

*The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces of and in Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.*

Until the Queen otherwise directs, the seat of Government of Canada shall be Ottawa.

Coming to the Government of Canada, there are two houses, the Commons and the Senate. The qualification for Senators shall be as follows:

He shall be of the full age of 30 years. He shall be either a native-born subject of the Queen or a subject of the Queen naturalized by an act of Parliament of Great Britain.

And so forth.

He shall be legally or equitably seised, as of freehold for his own use and benefit, of lands or tenements held in free and common socage, or seised or possessed for his own use and benefit of lands for tenements held in franc-allogue or in rotture within the Province for which he is appointed, of the value of \$4,000, over and above all rents, dues, debts, charges, mortgages, and incumbrances due or payable out of or charged on or affecting the same.

He has to be a rich man in order to be in the Senate. Here is how they are selected:

The Governor General shall from time to time, in the Queen's name, by instrument under the great seal of Canada, summon qualified persons to the Senate; and, subject to the provisions of this act, every person so summoned shall become and be a member of the Senate and a senator.

So they are not elected, but are appointed, or were, at the time of this act. If the law has been changed, I have not learned of it.

*Such persons shall be first summoned to the Senate as the Queen by warrant under Her Majesty's royal sign manual thinks fit to approve, and their names shall be inserted in the Queen's proclamation of union.*

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, does that read "summoned to the Senate by the Queen's royal sign manual"?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Under our practice we are summoned from the Senate under a royal sign manual.

Mr. REED. This proceeds:

If at any time on the recommendation of the Governor General the Queen thinks fit to direct that three or six members be added to the Senate, the Governor General may by summons to three or six qualified persons (as the case may be), representing equally the three divisions of Canada, add to the Senate accordingly.

In case of such addition being at any time made, the Governor General shall not summon any person to the Senate, except as a further like direction by the Queen, on the like recommendation, until each of the three divisions of Canada is represented by 24 senators and no more. A senator shall, subject to the provisions of this act, hold his place in the Senate for life.

That is a glorious democracy. If some of our Senators held for life, they might exercise their own opinions probably a little more freely just now, but likewise they would exercise them more freely when the voice of the American people would sound upon their deaf and secure ears.

A senator shall, "subject to the provisions of this act, hold his place in the Senate for life."

And then they give the disqualifications or the things that remove him. The fifth one of those is:

He shall cease to be a senator—

Now, notice. When the people of Canada want him out? When his constituency regard him as unfit? No— if he ceases to be qualified in respect of property or of residence;

So if a man loses his property, out he goes. No matter how honest he is, no matter how efficient he is, no matter how patriotic he is, if he has not the filthy lucre, he can not sit in this "democratic body" that is appointed for life, appointed not by the people but by the Crown.

Now, Mr. President, I want to read paragraph 4:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the Provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding



anything in this act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.

I shall not read them. It is sufficient to say that they deal with local matters. They do not deal with foreign matters. But I ask leave to have them printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VI. DISTRIBUTION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS.  
POWERS OF THE PARLIAMENT.

91. It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the Provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say—

1. The public debt and property.
2. The regulation of trade and commerce.
3. The raising of money by any mode or system of taxation.
4. The borrowing of money on the public credit.
5. Postal service.
6. The census and statistics.
7. Militia, military, and naval service and defense.
8. The fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada.
9. Beacons, buoys, lighthouses, and Sable Island.
10. Navigation and shipping.
11. Quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals.
12. Sea-coast and inland fisheries.
13. Ferries between a Province and any British or foreign country or between two Provinces.
14. Currency and coinage.
15. Banking, incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money.
16. Savings banks.
17. Weights and measures.
18. Bills of exchange and promissory notes.
19. Interest.
20. Legal tender.
21. Bankruptcy and insolvency.
22. Patents of invention and discovery.
23. Copyrights.
24. Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians.
25. Naturalization and aliens.
26. Marriage and divorce.
27. The criminal law, except the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters.
28. The establishment, maintenance, and management of penitentiaries.
29. Such classes of subjects as are expressly excepted in the enumeration of the classes of subjects by this act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the Provinces.

Mr. REED. So, Mr. President, there is your democratic independent government in Canada. The seat of authority in all matters is in the Imperial Government, but it has granted to Canada for the time being, and as long as it may see fit to so permit, a power over domestic affairs. But it has withheld power over international questions.

That I am correct in that is demonstrated by the words I am about to read. I hold in my hand a book entitled "Clements's Canadian Constitution." It is a commentary by the Hon. W. H. P. Clements, B. A., LL. B., judge of the supreme court of British Columbia. At page 134 this will be found:

Internationally, State recognizes only State. A colony, no matter how complete for purposes of local self-government its political organization may be, is nevertheless a subordinate community and has no place in the councils of the nations. It can not therefore be, internationally, a party to an act of State. In all intercourse with foreign powers the British nation is represented by the Crown, acting only upon the advice and with the consent of the British ministry.

Now, I call special attention to the words I am just going to read:

*The appointment of those who are to act as the accredited agents of the nation rests necessarily with the Crown in Council (Imperial).*

I read it again:

*The appointment of those who are to act as the accredited agents of the nation rests necessarily with the Crown in Council (Imperial). Treaties and diplomatic arrangements of all sorts are made between His Britannic Majesty as the Empire's representative and embodiment and the executive head of each foreign State. Over none of these matters have the colonial governments or legislatures any control or jurisdiction, prima facie.*

Who will appoint the representatives of Canada and of India and of Australia under this law? According to this author they can only be appointed by the Imperial Government of the Empire. No act of the British Parliament has yet been passed granting any such right to Canada.

It has been argued that Canada will act with the United States. I wonder if the representatives of Canada will act with the United States? Every Canadian officer of whatsoever character or degree is required to take an oath. I read that oath:

I, A. B., solemnly swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty, King George the Fifth, his heirs and successors, according to law.

So that the Canadian officer who goes to represent Canada upon the league does so with the oath resting upon his conscience that he will "be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty, King George the Fifth, his heirs and successors, according to law." Yet the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], who as usual is absent after having delivered his oration, would have us understand that a British subject, having taken that kind of an oath, will act independently of Great Britain, will owe the British Empire no allegiance, will be not only independent, but that he will vote with the United States against the very Government whose authority he has sworn to uphold and to which he has pledged his allegiance and faith before Almighty God in heaven. Mr. President, if absurdity can go further than that, then absurdity knows no limits.

There is one other point I want to make very briefly. I refer to the oft-repeated assertion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that in the League of Nations the South American States will vote with the United States. How does he know that? Some of them have come in and some of them have stayed out of the league; but let us assume that they all come in. How does the Senator from Nebraska know what the Latin States in South America will do in a controversy between the United States and any of other country over any question? As a matter of fact, practically all of their trade is with Europe. European nations have great banking houses established among them; European capital is financing them to a very large extent; European colonies or practically European colonies exist among all of them that are of importance. The ships of commerce do not chiefly ply between South American ports and those of the United States. They ply between South American ports and the ports of Europe. We have been trying to establish trade there with but indifferent results; indeed, we made but slight progress until the war rendered it almost impossible for South American States to trade with Europe. Now that the war is over, in order for us to maintain trade relations of importance we are finding it necessary to practically subsidize ships in order to have them ply between the United States and South American ports.

What is there to bind these people particularly to us? Their language is different. Their origin in Europe is not that of our people. The character of government handed to them by their fathers is not like our Government. However much it may resemble it in its outside form, its spirit and its substance are entirely lacking in nearly all of the South American States. I do not say this unkindly; but theirs is a Spanish civilization, not an Anglo-Saxon civilization.

I placed in the RECORD a good while ago statistics showing the degree of literacy in these countries, and it was astonishingly and disappointingly low in all of them. Where are their prejudices and their natural feelings? I wish that they were with North America; but is it not a fact that they have shown a disposition on numerous occasions not to stand with North America? When we entered this war the President summoned South American States to join us in what he then for the first time proclaimed a great world effort to regenerate and save mankind. Did they come? One or two of them technically declared war, and there the matter ended. So far as I know, not a dollar of money, not a soldier, not a gun did they contribute.

But, sir, I call attention to this important fact: South American countries like the Monroe doctrine when we are exercising it distinctly and absolutely to protect them in accordance with their wishes at the time.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator is doing a great injustice to Brazil. It contributed quite largely in ships and money to the war.

Mr. REED. I accept the correction. Can the Senator tell me how much they contributed?

Mr. MYERS. I can not give the exact amount of money nor the exact number of ships, but they contributed quite considerably.

Mr. REED. Very well; one out of all. It serves to point the absence of the rest.

It has frequently happened, as I was saying, that the South American countries have protested against the exercise by the United States of what some of them are pleased to regard at times as an arbitrary power, just as Mexico has recently repudiated the Monroe doctrine. Now, I am going to assume that every South American country joins the League of Nations. A controversy arises because the Government of one of the South American countries desires to make an arrangement with a European country which it thinks is to its advantage and which

the United States regards as a violation of the Monroe doctrine.

I want to ask Senators here why that State, under the League of Nations compact, can not appeal that controversy to the League of Nations and can not insist that it is entitled to the judgment and decision of the League of Nations without reference to that question? If they so insist, and the League of Nations votes with them and sustains them, what will be the remedy of the United States of America? Plainly we will have but one remedy, and that will be to repudiate the decision of the League of Nations and thus possibly bring upon us not only the enmity of South American States but the entire power of the world massed back of the league.

You can not have two sovereigns at the same time; you can not have two superior powers at the same time; you can not have a Monroe doctrine controlled by the United States of America and at the same time have members of the League of Nations who are of right entitled to go to the League of Nations for decision upon every disputed question which arises in this hemisphere or in the other.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say in regard to the matter, but this talk about Canada being an independent Government is balderdash, if I may use so common an expression.

What says the Senator from Nebraska about India? India will have a vote in the league. Is that the vote of an independent democracy? Eleven hundred Britishers constitute the governing class in India, where there are 290,000,000 people. I wonder if that Government, in the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska, is entitled to a representation as an independent people? Does he doubt that those 1,100 Britishers, all of them officers of the Crown, will fail to do the bidding of the Imperial Government of the Empire?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. The Senator will probably remember that the newspapers carried a story during the war that the real people of India indicated a willingness to furnish, I believe, 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 troops in exchange for self-government.

Mr. REED. Yes; I recollect that, but the people of India will probably recognize the fact that in all her history Great Britain has never relinquished her hold upon a country except when the demand for liberty was backed by an army she could not overcome.

Mr. President, to assume that 1,100 Britishers in India constitute a self-governing and independent colony, and that they are better entitled to a vote in the league than the great State of New York, or than half a dozen of the great Western States, or than any State in the Union, or than any city in the Union, or than any village in the Union, is to assume an absurdity. A man has to be afflicted, and very badly afflicted, with the disease known as Anglomania before he can stand on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere in this country and make the astonishing assertions just uttered by the Senator from Nebraska. He does not speak for me. He does not speak for the Democratic Party. He does not speak for the United States.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I have a very brief article by Mr. Samuel Russell, who has written considerably upon the League of Nations and upon fiscal matters, containing a short discussion of article 10 of the league covenant. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I will have to object.

Mr. KING. I understood that all articles with respect to the League of Nations, by common consent, did not come within the understanding that was entered into the other day.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that such articles come under the ban. The only articles allowed to go in the RECORD, if we can keep them from going in by a vote of the Senate, are resolutions from city councils and from the legislatures of States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made by the Senator from Utah to the request of his colleague.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate, as in open executive session, take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 8, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art the all in all, life of our life, spirit of our spirit, the confirmation of the immortality of the soul—a fairer life to be. But now is the day of salvation, one world at a time, to develop the good, the pure, the noble.

"Or ever the silver cord be loosed, or the golden bowl be broken, or the pitcher be broken at the fountain, or the wheel broken at the cistern.

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

Deliver us, we beseech Thee, from the petty cares of life, the discords which spoil the harmony of the soul with Thee. Let faith be our anchor, hope be our lead, and love reign supreme, that we may meet the life that now is with calmness, serenity, and nobility of soul. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 6, 1920, was read and approved.

### THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. WALSH assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes on a personal matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, the rule allows the Speaker to appoint a substitute for only one day, but it does allow him in case of illness to nominate a substitute for 10 days. I have been so fortunate in the nine months that we have been in session as not to lose a day on account of illness, and I do not make any requests for sympathy on account of ill health now, but at the same time I have been getting a little fagged, and I believe a short change would do me good. Therefore, I am going to ask unanimous consent of the House that I may appoint a substitute to act for me for 10 days, and I submit the following order and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I ought to say that I have consulted the Committee on Rules about this and they unanimously acquiesced in my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the order, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Speaker may at any time during the present month name a Member to perform the duties of the Chair for a period not exceeding 10 legislative days, who shall have authority to sign bills and appoint select and conference committees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Tennessee speaks I would like to say that I think the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], the present Speaker, ought to be made a permanent rule of the House. I had eight years' experience as Speaker of this House. Speakers, like other Members, have occasionally to go somewhere, and if they went everywhere they were invited to go they would be on what Charles II called travels all of the time, and the one day for which the Speaker may appoint a substitute under the rules is entirely too short a time. For instance, if the Speaker is invited over to New York or to Pittsburgh or somewhere else to make a speech on an important occasion, he has to hurry a good deal to get back even from New York within the day. He can not get back from Pittsburgh. When Senator Stone died the Missouri delegation wanted me to go as one of the funeral party. I was exceedingly fond of Senator Stone and under profound obligations to him. It would take six days to go where he was to be buried and get back here. I did not ask permission, but the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], then acting as minority leader, very graciously asked unanimous consent that I be permitted to appoint a Speaker while I was gone, which I did. It turned out that instead of finishing that trip I had to go to New York to see my son, who was to go to France with the Army. It took about 10 days to do what I did at that time.

There is no sense in this one-day performance. I am in favor of making this a permanent rule of the House. It is



an exceedingly stupendous assumption to think that there is nobody in the House fit to preside over the House except the Speaker. What I propose would give the Speaker some leeway, such as other Members have. Any other Member of the House can pick up and leave here and go away and stay a week or two weeks, and some of them three or four months, without asking the consent of anyone. It is not fair to the Speaker.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I reserved the right to object, I feel that in justice to myself I should make this statement. The Speaker did the Committee on Rules the honor of consulting it with regard to this matter. The minority members of that committee were very happy to accede to the Speaker's request and to agree that a rule would be presented providing for this, if it should be necessary to do so. On behalf of the minority members of that committee I want to say that we are most happy to do this courtesy to the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, of course I shall not object to the request, but I take it that the substitute would be a Speaker pro tempore. I have not examined the precedents lately, but I think that where the Speaker pro tempore is authorized to sign bills and appoint conferees, it is necessary for the House to notify the Senate and possibly the President.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. During the last Congress on one occasion, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was acting as Speaker of the House, I had the honor of being elected Speaker pro tempore, being elected by the House. An examination was then made of the precedents, and it was determined that as a matter of safety it was best for the Speaker pro tempore to take the oath, and also that the Senate and the President be notified.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Was that done by resolution of the House?

Mr. GARRETT. It was done by resolution of the House—that is, the notification to the Senate and the President.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I should think that would be necessary.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I have not the floor.

Mr. DYER. I want to ask the gentleman a question. In the case to which he has referred in the last Congress was the Speaker pro tempore elected by the House or appointed by the Speaker himself?

Mr. GARRETT. My recollection for the moment is that I was elected by the House.

Mr. DYER. That is my recollection.

Mr. GARRETT. I may have been designated by the Speaker, but I think I was elected by the House. It was only for a day, I think, but in any event, whichever was the case, I took the oath as Speaker pro tempore, and a formal resolution was prepared notifying the Senate and the President.

Mr. DYER. Is that the idea now, that the House shall elect somebody for 10 days?

Mr. GILLET. No; this order authorizes the Speaker to designate somebody.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish merely to say I know it is the sentiment of every Member of the House on both sides of this Chamber that our present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, may not be detained from his duties on account of illness and that he may continue to present himself in his customary fine fettle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GILLET. I ask for the immediate consideration of the order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the order, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Speaker may at any time during the present month name a Member to perform the duties of the Chair for a period not exceeding 10 legislative days, who shall have authority to sign bills and appoint select and conference committees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the order presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is that the Speaker or the Speaker pro tempore?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will again report the order as presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The order was again reported.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I think possibly there ought to be added to the order "and which designation is hereby approved by the House." I offer an amendment to that effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Add at the end of the order the following: "And which designation is hereby approved by the House."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the order as amended.

The question was taken, and the order as amended was agreed to.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the election of Mr. CULLEN, of New York, to fill a minority vacancy on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Mr. McCLINTIC, of Oklahoma, to fill the minority vacancy on Election Committee No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the election of certain Members to fill vacancies upon committees, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN moves the election of Mr. CULLEN, of New York, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Mr. McCLINTIC, of Oklahoma, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Elections No. 1.

The question was taken, and the nominations were agreed to.

#### ARMY REORGANIZATION BILL.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution No. 480.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12775, being a bill to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916. That there shall be not to exceed six hours of general debate on said bill, to be confined to the subject matter of the bill, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California, Mr. KAHN, and one-half by the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. DENT. That at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read under the five-minute rule. That during the consideration of the bill the House shall meet at the hour of 11 o'clock antemeridian. That at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendments the bill shall be reported to the House with amendments, if any, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the following amendment: Substitute in line 8 the word "ten" for "six." I will say when this rule was proposed it was understood by the Rules Committee that if the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the minority desired more time it would be granted. They have informed me this morning that it would be necessary to have 10 hours for general debate. I ask unanimous consent to insert the word "ten" in place of the word "six" in line 8.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I had hoped we would be able to get the consideration of this measure without practically two days of general debate. My experience is a long general debate does not shorten the time for the consideration of a bill ordinarily. I ask the gentleman from California if it is essential that there shall be as long as 10 hours' general debate?

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I have requests for six and a half hours' debate on my side.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Upon the bill itself or upon other matters?

Mr. SNELL. The rule provides debate shall be confined to the bill itself.

Mr. KAHN. My requests are for debate on the bill.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman no doubt knows that a good deal of time will be needed to satisfy the membership of the House that the bill ought to be passed in its present form.

Mr. KAHN. Well, I suppose all bills that come in could not be passed exactly in the form in which they came in. The membership of the House is allowed to offer amendments, and I hope that in the general debate we may explain many of the provisions of the bill about which the Members may be in doubt.

Mr. DYER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Is it the intention of the chairman of the committee to make points of order against everything that is subject to the point of order in trying to amend the bill and make it so it will be a real bill?

Mr. KAHN. This is a reorganization bill, and anything that is not germane I certainly shall make points of order on.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentlemen would talk out louder.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama how many requests he has for time, and how much time those requests cover?

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman that I have requests for at least three and a half hours from minority members of the committee itself, and in addition to that I have requests from at least 8 or 10 Members on this side who are not members of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Who desire to discuss the bill?

Mr. DENT. Who desire to discuss the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we frequently start out with many requests for time on a measure, on which remarks are to be confined to the measure only, to discover as the debate goes on that gentleman conclude they do not care to speak. It seems to me if we are to spend 10 hours in the discussion of this bill on matters relating to it the discussion should be pretty broad so as to embrace all subjects that in any wise relate to the bill or military matters generally. As a matter of fact, if the debate is to run for 10 hours, I do not think it should be confined to the bill. Of course the gentleman in charge of the bill can first grant time to those who desire to discuss the bill, and any time remaining within 10 hours, it seems to me, should be allotted to those who desire to discuss other matters.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman from Wyoming yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. GARRETT. I simply wish to say to the gentleman from Wyoming that this was a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MONDELL. That is, the amendment?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; with the understanding that if the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] should desire this additional time and should agree upon it it would be inserted as 10 hours, and that it should be confined to the bill. The resolution as presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is precisely the resolution which came to the Committee on Rules and which limited debate to the bill. Now, we do not wish to extend the time for general debate in order to talk about matters other than the bill, and it was represented to us that 10 hours was desirable in order to discuss the bill itself. Of course gentlemen will know it provides for not exceeding 10 hours.

Mr. SNELL. If it is not necessary to use all of that time, we will get through quicker.

Mr. GARRETT. If it is not necessary, naturally the bill will be taken up under the five-minute rule at once.

Mr. MONDELL. In view of the statement just made by the gentleman from Tennessee, I do not feel that I would be justified in objecting, but I do regret that we are to spend so much time on general debate on this particular measure. There are a number of gentlemen who desire to discuss other matters, and if they could have been accommodated within 10 hours it would have relieved the situation somewhat. Spending 10 hours on this bill is giving a good deal of time. However, under the circumstances, the agreement having been made with the Committee on Rules, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. Can I ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] a question? The Ways and Means Committee was hurriedly called together on Saturday, and I was informed that if we would change the foreign-relief bill, which the committee unanimously reported out several weeks ago, that the Rules Committee would immediately report a rule for its immediate consideration. I understood that we were to take that up this morning the first thing. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming, the majority leader, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], who is on the Rules Committee, what has become of that proposition?

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I have no knowledge whatever of the understanding or the arrangement to which the gentleman refers. I know nothing of it. I have not been consulted in regard to it.

Mr. SNELL. I can say to the gentleman from North Carolina that this is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we had about 15 or 20 minutes in the committee on it, and it was stated by the chairman that if we would change it and make the relief 5,000,000 barrels of flour instead of \$50,000,000, which the corporation now has on hand, the Rules Committee would report out a rule at once.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of asking a question, and I think I shall object unless some arrangement can be made, there are some of us who would like to get a few moments of time to talk on something outside of this bill, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming when some of us can get an opportunity to have a few moments to discuss other matters?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, as I can answer that, as I do not control the situation in regard to debate. I preferred to have the debate in connection with this bill of such a character that the gentleman could get in, but I would suggest to the gentleman that inasmuch as the Committee on Rules has agreed to confine all the debate to the bill, and there is a desire to do that, it would be better to have the arrangement stand, in the hope that before long the gentleman may be able to secure time.

Mr. POUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. POUL. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Wyoming, the majority leader, if it would not be possible, in view of the fact that all of Saturday was consumed in useless debate, that another day might be set apart for similar debate as was held here on last Saturday? It might be the steering committee would order the Rules Committee to report out a rule setting aside another day, and give gentlemen an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MONDELL. There may be some gentlemen so constituted as to think that a waste of a billion dollars of the people's money and the discussion of that waste and the deplorable conditions created, was a useless matter, but it seems important to most people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask some one if this resolution means to dispose of Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. SNELL. I can say to the gentleman it does not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] that unanimous consent be given to increase the general debate from 6 to 10 hours. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to make this inquiry, whether the debate under this request is going to be confined strictly to this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is provided in the resolution; that it is to be confined to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced that there was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman can not object now. Unanimous consent was given.

The SPEAKER. House resolution 480 simply makes it in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes."

In other words, it is a general amendment to the Hay Act, which was passed in June, 1916. As I understand, this bill does not make any material change in our national establishment. It simply provides for changes in detail, which lapse of time and experience show us are necessary to be made at this time. It is brought in here under a special rule for the reason that it is absolutely necessary definitely to provide for the Regular Establishment before the general Army appropriation bill can be presented to the House.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. In a second. This comes with a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules. Now, I yield to the gentleman.



Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman understand and say that that is the intention—that not only during the time that we have general debate on these two days but on other days when we are to consider the bill under the five-minute rule the House shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. SNELL. That was the intention.

Mr. WINGO. Commencing to-morrow, then, we begin at 11 o'clock and meet at 11 o'clock as long as this bill is under consideration?

Mr. SNELL. As long as this bill is under consideration. Now, does the gentleman from North Carolina desire some time?

Mr. POU. I would like eight minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina eight minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I really may not need the five minutes. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] a question. As I stated a moment ago, the Committee on Ways and Means was hurriedly called together on Saturday to consider a revision of the so-called foreign-relief bill, which had been reported out a month ago unanimously, appropriating \$50,000,000 to relieve the starvation and hunger in Austria and Armenia and other suffering peoples of Europe. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, whom I have always found to be most reliable in any of his statements, stated to the committee the object of the meeting, to wit, that the Committee on Rules had signified to him its willingness to report a rule out immediately if we would amend the so-called relief bill by substituting for the \$50,000,000 specifically 5,000,000 barrels of flour, and it was stated, the evidence before the Committee on Rules showed, that the Grain Corporation had 5,000,000 barrels of flour on hand which was a clear profit in their dealing in and selling wheat to foreign countries; that this was flour that could not be sold or disposed of in the United States because it was of an inferior grade and the people of the United States demanded a better and higher grade of flour than that, but that it could be used for the purpose of relieving hunger and preventing starvation in certain parts of Europe just as well as the highest grade of flour. The committee unanimously, in deference to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the chairman of the committee, and in view of his statement as to the conduct of the Committee on Rules, did so amend that bill—in fact we wrote the bill—proposed a new bill carrying out exactly what he told us the Committee on Rules favored. We were assured by him that if we did report it out the Committee on Rules would report a rule for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. We did report out that bill, and I was curious to know what has become of the assurance given to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means by the Committee on Rules that if we did this, they would give us a rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me state that since the committee reported out the first relief bill unanimously a month ago at least 20,000 people have died of hunger and starvation in the very countries which this bill was aimed to relieve.

Mr. MADDEN. Did not Mr. Barnes say that, as the head of the Grain Corporation, he has the power to sell this flour without any action on the part of Congress?

Mr. KITCHIN. I was not present when Mr. Barnes appeared before the Committee on Rules, but I understand that he expressed the opinion that it could be construed that he really had the power to dispose of it to such countries; and if Congress would not give him the power to do it, if he could not get the sanction of Congress, rather than see human beings in Armenia and Austria and other countries dying daily, starving, when the corporation had this inferior flour which could not be disposed of here, he would take the chance of selling it or disposing of it to them on some terms.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to know where the gentleman got his information that 20,000 people had died of starvation?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have seen it mentioned in the newspapers, and I have received circulars, which have been sent out to that effect.

Mr. CALDWELL. I wrote the gentleman a letter that covered that.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I saw the letter to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. CALDWELL. If the gentleman will wait one minute, I will show that 20,000 have died.

Mr. KITCHIN. Secretary GLASS told us a month ago in his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means that a gentleman of high reputation had come to his office and told him that he happened to drive by automobile only two blocks in a city in Austria, and along those two blocks he saw 27 dead men, women, and children, with their clothes on, that had actually perished from hunger.

Mr. KEARNS. Where was that?

Mr. KITCHIN. A city of Austria, near Vienna, the name of which has just this moment escaped my memory.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me first make my statement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] for a question.

Mr. KEARNS. I see from the terms of the peace treaty that Austria, where the gentleman says these men, women, and children are dying, this year is to deliver as indemnity or fine for entering the war 19,000 head of cattle, 30,000 head of sheep, and I think 25,000 hogs. Now, they are paying that this year as indemnity to the allied countries. Are we in turn to go over there with our flour and our money and pay to Austria in compensation for the things that have been taken from her? Then we are paying Austria's indemnity, and what crime have we committed?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; we are not paying Austria's indemnity at all. The hogs and cattle, and so forth, that the gentleman speaks of, if that is the fact, are being forced from them at the point of bayonet, and that makes Austria that much less able to supply herself with food.

Now, I want to say to the House and to the Republican membership, and especially to the Committee on Rules and to the steering committee, that from all the evidence, unless we come to the rescue of the people in Austria and Budapest, they can get no relief from any nation on earth, because the Allies have declined to let Austria and Budapest have a single dollar. They said if you get any relief you will have to look to America for it. We must or should furnish quick relief also to Armenia.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to ask the gentleman if the emergency was so great, and Mr. Barnes says it is so great, why is it that he has not exercised the power and performed the duties which the law imposes upon him?

Mr. KITCHIN. Because he prefers to have the sanction of Congress, and Congress ought to take the responsibility. If he did do it without Congress giving approval you Republicans would denounce the administration for doing it and demand an investigation. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. As to what Mr. Barnes said before the Rules Committee on the conditions of Europe, as the gentleman states, the gentleman does not want to make a statement that was not made before the Rules Committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am only stating what I saw in the papers—what was stated before our committee.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Barnes said nothing about conditions in Europe. He did not mention them. He simply made the request that he be authorized to sell five and one-half million barrels of flour, because it would be wasted when the warm weather came. He said he had the authority to do it, but he preferred to get the authority of Congress.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did not the Rules Committee at that time have evidence from other witnesses of the horrible conditions and the sufferings in Europe?

Mr. FESS. We did; but Mr. Barnes did not put it on the basis of feeding Europe but on the basis of saving the flour.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Diverting from the conditions in Europe, I want to get the parliamentary situation. The Ways and Means Committee amended the bill and put in the words that were wanted, with the assurance that the rule would be reported immediately on Saturday evening or this morning. If the Ways and Means Committee, by unanimous consent, report a bill with the assurance of the Rules Committee—

Mr. FESS. What assurance of the Rules Committee did the Ways and Means Committee have?



Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], chairman of the committee, said that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] said so. I want to ask the gentleman, when we get an assurance from the chairman of the committee that that thing can be done, what power is there in the House of Representatives that prevents it?

Mr. KITCHIN. The only power is the steering committee and the Rules Committee.

Mr. GARNER. Then, in the future had we not better get a statement from Mr. FORDNEY that the steering committee has given assurance that this rule will be reported out?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I want to say, in connection with the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS], that Austria was being compelled to pay an indemnity of so many thousand head of cattle and so many thousand head of live stock; I want to call attention to the fact that Germany was subjected to an immense indemnity, but has paid none of it. I dare say that the gentleman will find that to be literally true as to Austria.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, all this discussion is entirely out of order at this time, and unless there is some definite question as to this rule or this bill, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. SABATH, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. OSBORNE, for three weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAYTON, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

#### TO AMEND NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12775.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DYER) there were 182 ayes and 4 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to suggest to the gentleman from California the fact that instead of giving starving Europe bread, the Rules Committee is now giving us 10 hours' debate on a military bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in bringing our Army from a war-time strength of 5,000,000 men down to the size required for the country on a peace-time basis, a great deal of legislation is absolutely necessary, and it should be enacted at this time, at any rate before the end of the fiscal year, July 1. The committee after three months of patient work has brought before the House this bill. I do not claim that it is an absolutely perfect measure, but from the amount of work and care with which it has been considered in the committee I do believe that it represents about as near a practical reorganization measure for the Army as it is possible for a committee of this House to bring forth.

In substance it provides for a peace-time Regular Army in this country of a maximum of 299,000 enlisted men and 17,600 commissioned officers. Of the 299,000 men we provide that 250,000 shall be combatant troops and 30,000 of them are to be non-combatant enlisted men. There are 12,000 Philippine scouts

and 7,000 unassigned recruits, bringing the total up to 299,000 men. We have provided for a very large number of commissioned officers for this force. Our purpose in doing that fulfills several requirements, the principal one being for surplus officers to provide an adequate number for training purposes in this country. We intend to detail about a thousand officers for duties with the National Guard and other military organizations. We intend to have available for detail from 1,000 to 1,500 officers to schools and colleges, reserve officers' training camps' training units, and citizen training camps, in order to provide ample instruction for all the young men in the country who desire military training.

In my opinion compulsory universal training is undesirable at this time. With a deficit of \$4,000,000,000 between the receipts and expenditures of the Federal Treasury staring us in the face for this year, with the knowledge that the initial first-year cost of training the 800,000 eligible young men would be very close to \$1,000,000,000 in addition to the cost of our Regular Army and National Guard, which under this bill is estimated from \$480,000,000 to \$600,000,000, I am convinced that our committee has acted wisely in postponing consideration of compulsory training until another session of Congress, when we can have the benefit of more careful and detailed information on the subject.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will this provision made in this bill be sufficient to take care of these requirements of high schools where they have cadet corps established under the reserve act?

Mr. ANTHONY. In my opinion the number of officers provided for in this act will be ample to satisfy all such requirements. In fact, one of the estimates which was made to us when we were considering the bill was that it would be possible under this bill to have 150,000 young men in training in this country each year in the schools and colleges, Reserve Officers' Training Corps units, and in citizen training camps. We also provide for a large list of detached officers who are to be used for the purpose of carrying out the single list of promotions provided in the bill and to enable a sufficiently large reservoir of officers to exist, from which officers may be drawn to perform detached duties without interfering with the line troops of the Army.

I deem that it is absolutely necessary at this time to provide for a strong regular Military Establishment in this country, not for purposes of external defense or aggression primarily, but I believe that this country needs a strong Regular Establishment for its internal protection for some years to come, following this Great War, and we are providing such an establishment by this bill, sufficient to preserve law and order and civilized constitutional government.

Our second purpose is to rehabilitate the National Guard. It is well known that following the war the National Guard units were discharged wholesale upon their release from the National Army. It was never intended by Congress when it passed the national-defense act that any power should be lodged in the War Department which would enable it to practically destroy the National Guard at one blow, but suffice to say that the War Department has assumed that power, and by its arbitrary discharge from every obligation of State and national service of every unit of the National Guard which went into the Army during the war it has all but destroyed the National Guard of the various States. In this bill we are providing liberal legislation under which we hope to again build up the guard to its former authorized strength under the national-defense act, which we believe in a few years will give us a National Guard approximating 400,000 men to serve not only as a second line of defense in this country but as an efficient first line whenever called out in conjunction with the Regular Army, as was amply demonstrated in the present war on the battle fields of Europe.

It is not my purpose to go into all of the details of the bill at this time, but simply to make this general statement in regard to it. We are, as I said, vastly increasing the number of commissioned officers. We are providing for an increase of about 7,000 officers over the number authorized by the national-defense act.

One of our purposes in doing this is to take care of some of the most splendid fighting officer material that the country has ever seen, as developed by this war. We have 24,000 applications on file at the War Department from officers who saw service in this war who desire commissions in the Regular Army, and we are providing that of the 7,000 vacancies in the Regular Establishment created by this act at least one-half of that number shall be taken from those men who saw service in the National Army during the years of the war just closed.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.



Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman, if he can do so in his time without interrupting the trend of his remarks, state briefly what the bill does provide that will build up the National Guard to something like it was before?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. One of the most essential things this bill provides is to start in right at the top. We provide that the Chief of the Militia Bureau down at the War Department shall be a National Guard officer instead of a Regular Army officer. [Applause.] It has been found that with an officer of the Regular Army at the head of the Militia Bureau, instead of the bureau being allowed to be free to exercise what is thought best for the development of the National Guard, the bureau has been dominated by the purpose of the General Staff to destroy the guard, and it has been working at cross purposes all of these years. We propose to correct that evil by appointing a National Guard officer at the head of the Militia Bureau, and I believe it will go far to accomplish that purpose. Another thing this bill does is to reenact the provision of the national-defense act that provides that the General Staff will no longer serve as an operating force in the War Department. We eliminate them from the duties which they assumed during the war, not only to give advice on military matters and to prepare military plans, but they actually operated all of the bureaus of the War Department during the war, and, in my opinion, were responsible for the era of chaos, confusion, and extravagance that resulted from such domination and administration. Under this bill we divorce absolutely the General Staff from such operations and return them to their own field, to offer advice and prepare plans, and so forth.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman mentioned the fact that of the 7,000 additional commissioned officers that go into the Army after the passage of this bill one-half of them would be those men who had served in the National Army during the war.

Mr. ANTHONY. That not less than one-half should be composed of those men.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Where will the other portion come from?

Mr. ANTHONY. The other portion will come from a great many other sources. They will come from the Military Academy, from the ranks, from the National Guard, perhaps from the reserve officers training camps, primarily, the reserve officers, and of the other vacancies created Regular Army officers will be promoted to fill into them, and also they will come from graduates of technical schools.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Some of these noncommissioned officers who were given commissioned rank during the war would be given opportunity for a permanent commission rank?

Mr. ANTHONY. They would come under the provision of the bill requiring that not less than one-half of these vacancies, 3,500, must be so filled, and we have safeguarded that by providing that these appointments shall be made under regulations drawn by a board which we believe can not help but be absolutely fair in its administration. We provide that the board which shall have charge of such appointments shall be composed of three general officers of the line, of three general officers of the Staff Corps, and Gen. Pershing, the commander in chief of the Army.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Would the gentleman be kind enough to tell the House what has been done for the medical unit of the service and for the nurses in this bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. In making provision for the Medical Corps in this bill we endeavor to do the same as they are provided for under the national-defense act. We keep in force the same provision requiring 7 medical officers to each 1,000 of enlisted men. I will say this to the gentleman: Under the provision of the single-promotion list some medical officers are contending that their interests are perhaps not as liberally provided for in the way of promotion as they should be. There is some question as to that and it is my hope that it may be satisfactorily worked out in the discussion of the bill.

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman will admit they should have a little more authority than they have had in order to be efficient.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would not say more authority. Does the gentleman mean more rank, more promotion?

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. We are providing in this bill each medical officer shall have two years of constructive service in order to make up the time he spends in a medical college preparing for his medical education, in addition to giving him the initial rank

of first lieutenant. But it does require not two years but, in my opinion, it requires five years longer for a medical officer to prepare himself for the service than for a man to go through West Point or come into the Army from civil life, and he should have the benefit of even more than the two years' constructive service, I will say to the gentleman, than is provided for.

Mr. LAZARO. Now, in regard to nurses?

Mr. ANTHONY. They have been given constructive rank in the bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course, the bill provides that a medical officer on entry into the service has to his credit two years of constructive service, but he is put in the grade of a first lieutenant, which, of course, may more than equal the time of five years which the other man starting as a second lieutenant often would have to serve before he could become a first lieutenant. So when we take that phase of it into consideration the period of two years as denominated by the figures in the bill does not indicate all the advantage the medical officer gets, because the passage from the grade of second lieutenant to that of first lieutenant of a line officer is frequently five years, and sometimes it has been more.

Mr. LAZARO. So the gentleman's impression is that it is a benefit to the medical man and the service?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We intended it to be so.

Mr. LAZARO. Of course, the gentleman realizes that the man in the service gets the benefit of it?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We are trying to approach it, as the gentleman from Kansas stated.

Mr. ANTHONY. Now, gentlemen, during the war the administration of the Army was split up into a great number of independent bureaus and committees in the War Department for the operation and administration of the Army. That method resulted not alone in inefficiency but in uncalled-for extravagance. We are endeavoring to remedy that situation in this bill by combining and consolidating a number of different bureaus created under the power of the Overman Act into one administration, where we undoubtedly are not only going to provide for increased efficiency, but under the consolidation, so far as we have gone in this bill, we are going to save by the measure from thirty to fifty million dollars a year in administration expenses alone; that is, in the overhead expenses of operating these various bureaus.

The measure does not go as far as I personally would like to see it go in this respect. We have combined the Construction Corps, Motor Transportation Corps, Purchase, Storage and Traffic, and several other bureaus and branches in the War Department and restored them where they were before the war, where they belong, under the administration of the Quartermaster General, and by such a consolidation we will show an economy of from thirty to fifty million dollars a year. In my opinion we should have gone further. This bill provides for a separate Finance Corps, and yet there is no question that by also consolidating that corps with the others it will further save the country \$3,000,000 a year, which is the price which must be paid for the administration of this corps as a separate branch. In making such a remark it is not my intention to cast the slightest aspersion upon the gentleman who is the head of that corps, Gen. Lord, who is a very efficient officer, as are his men under him; but it can be conclusively shown that the duties of that corps can be just as well performed in the consolidated establishment under the same officers and save the country \$3,000,000 a year by so doing, and I believe it is the duty of this Congress to go further along the line and consolidate and include that with the others.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. HAWLEY. When the gentleman refers to this matter of \$3,000,000 he refers to the salary cost of that department?

Mr. ANTHONY. The salaries of officers and men and the salaries of the clerks necessary for its administration.

Mr. HAWLEY. Would not there be a balance on the other of the benefit of a separate effective finance officer and corps in looking after the contracts and administration and an expenditure that might save the Government a great deal more money than \$3,000,000, which they cost?

Mr. ANTHONY. It might, but it has not been shown that they have ever saved any money. It is merely a useless extra cost.

Mr. HAWLEY. No such audit has been had—

Mr. ANTHONY. There is only one auditor—the Auditor for the War Department, who really audits the bills, and, in my opinion, this additional audit is unnecessary and an additional expense.



Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman's proposition is really the establishment of a sort of budget system in the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it simply means we create a separate corps of officers and men and clerks to make out checks instead of the Quartermaster General's Department. Let me go further and show the gentleman how this multiplication of separate activities works.

Under the division of these bureaus and activities during the war it meant that at every one of the posts and camps in this country, where before the war one quartermaster officer used not only to look after construction and after the supply of the troops, and used not only to pay the men and all the bills and to look after the transportation, both horse and motor, and all that, in place of that one officer you have about seven there to-day. You have a motor transport officer, a quartermaster officer, and a finance officer, and so forth. They are standing in each other's way to-day, with nothing for them to do, where one officer could just as well do the work. That is the situation. At Camp Sherman, Ohio, as developed by a report from there the other day by an officer who analyzed the Government expense bills there for one month and showed an absolute unnecessary expense in overhead at that one camp alone of over \$100,000 per month that could be saved by consolidating these various bureaus and functions and all the clerks and appurtenances that go with them. We are trying to do that, in a measure, in this bill, only, in my opinion, we do not go far enough.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman call attention to the provision the committee has made in the bill for a representative in the financial department, to be drawn from some other unit of the Army, in small encampments and smaller places?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that could be done.

Mr. MILLER. Is not provision made for it in the bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think so.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. While the gentleman is discussing the various bureaus I would like to ask what provision has been made for the quick expansion of these bureaus in the event of an emergency?

Mr. ANTHONY. The only provision that is made for their quick expansion will be that we trust the department will select competent men to put at the head of them, because, in my opinion, the personal equation is the main question involved. It is the personal capacity of the men at the head when the crisis comes. We are going further, though, and consolidating all the purchases for the Army under a civilian head in this bill. We are creating the position of Undersecretary or Assistant Secretary of War, who shall have charge of all the purchases and the business of the Army. We superimpose him over all these different purchasing bureaus, and we hope through him we will secure the long-sought-for business efficiency that in some way some Army officers seem to lack, notwithstanding the fact that they have other splendid qualities.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think that with the construction work as a part of the Quartermaster General's office and not a separate and distinct bureau, it could be just as rapidly expanded for emergency purposes?

Mr. ANTHONY. Just as rapidly expanded in time of emergency. Before the war the Quartermaster's Department, having charge of construction, did efficient work. Of course, no peace-time organization can fill all the demands that come with a world war and the raising of an army of 5,000,000 in place of an army of 100,000 men. There is no organization that can stand up against such a test as that, but we believe we retain the principles of these different bureaus by this consolidation. We take them with the same head, the same organization, simply reducing them in size and grouping them under one administration to save overhead expense. That is what we are doing in this bill, and in time of emergency there is no reason why they can not be expanded and thrown wide open.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. WELLING. I notice in section 2 of the bill there is no provision for a Transport Corps as at present organized.

Mr. ANTHONY. We take the Motor Transport Corps and consolidate it with the establishment of the Quartermaster General as it was before the war and as provided in the national-defense act.

Mr. WELLING. Does the gentleman think that will contribute to economy?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it will contribute much to economy. I have the figures here—

Mr. WELLING. I will be glad to hear that some time during the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not get those figures now. But I will say to the gentleman that it will save several million dollars per annum to the Government.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Speaking of the undersecretary that has charge of the purchases, what would be his relationship to the different departments, namely, the Quartermaster General and the Chief of Ordnance?

Mr. ANTHONY. It means that all the purchasing officers of the department will report to this undersecretary of war, the Assistant Secretary of War, who shall be in entire authority over all purchases and business transactions of the Army. Instead of going up to the Chief of Staff, as is now the custom, and the Secretary of War, the reports of the Quartermaster General, the records of the business operations of the Chief of Ordnance, and all that, in regard to purchases, will go direct to this Assistant Secretary of War in charge of purchases.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the Assistant Secretary of War be in office during peace time as well as in war time? Will he be a permanent officer?

Mr. ANTHONY. He will be a permanent officer of the department.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. In the event of war, would there be any addition to his department?

Mr. ANTHONY. Of course, it could be expanded; but we do not believe there will be any unnecessary additional organization. In my opinion, one of the drawbacks to our operation during the present war was that we expanded too far. We created too many bureaus, too many separate committees at the War Department, in charge of the business at the department, until we reached the point of absolute confusion. We went too far in that respect.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I think I agree with the gentleman in some respects, but the thing I had in mind particularly was that I frequently heard it said during the war that the great difficulty with the Ordnance Department and with the Quartermaster General's Department was the fact that we were suddenly thrown into a situation where it became a great proposition, and that we had military men at the head of those departments, and what we needed was the business force of the country at the head of those departments. Is this supposed to cure that?

Mr. ANTHONY. We do attempt to improve such a situation as that by the putting in of this civil officer at the head of all these purchasing bureaus. Let me say to the gentleman that the bringing into the military service of this great number of "big-business" men during the war was, in my opinion, anything but a success. Some of the most conspicuous failures in the War Department were the representatives of "big business" that were put in charge of military bureaus down there. The Regular Army officer, who has had his training not only as to military methods, but combined with the business training that his work gives him, is, in my opinion, far more efficient than the average civil business man for the performance of Army duties.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I agree with part of that. I do not know whether I agree with all of it or not.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I understand this bill takes from the General Staff duties that it has heretofore performed. Does it reduce the personnel of that staff proportionately to what it was before the war?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it does not. It leaves them, I think, about 99 men.

Mr. KAHN. Ninety-three men.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If they have less duties to perform, why should they not be reduced?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. The scope of the General Staff was necessarily enlarged by this war. The training and planning work of the General Staff alone is enough to keep the staff busy for years to come. With the assimilation of thousands of new officers who will require years of training yet before they reach the perfection we would like to see them attain, the General Staff will find its hands full. We do turn the General Staff back to the duties prescribed for it by the national-defense act, and we eliminate from it absolutely the work of administration and operation of the general affairs of the Army.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the Transport Corps. Is it the purpose to eliminate that entirely, and not have a corps at all?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the construction given to the language of the bill the Motor Transport Corps will be removed in a body into the Quartermaster Corps. It will function practically as it does now, under the same head. Gen. Drake is at the head of the Transport Corps now. We provided three brigadier generals in the Quartermaster Corps. It is the intention that Gen. Drake shall be one of these. The only thing that will happen to his organization will be that it will be cut down in



proportion to the peace-time strength as provided in this bill, and his superior officer, whom he reports to, will be the Quartermaster General. In other words, the papers in his branch will clear over the desk of the Quartermaster General.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman does not think that the Quartermaster's Department might regard it as they did before the corps was established and when we had motor vehicles simply as subsidiaries instead of what has now become a great means of transportation, and not give it the attention that it might have if it were kept separate? What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. ANTHONY. I say it all depends upon the personal element involved. Just at this time we happen to have a highly efficient man in the office of Quartermaster General.

Mr. DONOVAN. Gen. Rogers?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, Gen. Rogers; one of the best business men and best officers I have ever seen in the United States Army.

Mr. DONOVAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. With such a man in that place of responsibility, I do not think there is any doubt about an efficient and economical administration of all these various activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the salient features of this bill are: It is an amendment to the national-defense act and therefore does not change the fundamentals of our Military Establishment, even though it makes some radical departures; it prescribes the total enlisted and commissioned strength of the Army and leaves the minor details to experienced officers; it places one man, namely, the Assistant Secretary of War, at the head of all procurements for the Army; it reorganizes the National Guard and gives it an executive head who will be in sympathy with the growth of that organization; it provides for one-year enlistment for soldiers; it provides for the single list of promotion for commissioned officers; it prescribes limitations on the General Staff and does away with the unlimited power now held by that organization; it creates a separate Air Service and separate Chemical Warfare Service; it makes permanent law what all loyal churchmen want, that there shall be one chaplain to every 1,200 men in the Army; these besides many other changes which I have not the time nor the opportunity to mention.

Prior to the enactment of the national-defense act there had been but little change in the Military Establishment for more than a decade; the organization was based on conditions that existed during the Spanish-American War, and as a result many abuses had crept in, and we had a War Department inefficient, not because of the lack of a capable personnel but because the system was so cumbersome that it could not function properly. After the European war broke out and when it became apparent that the United States would in all probability be involved, it became the duty of Congress to provide for our military organization in order that it might be prepared to meet any emergency. As a result the national-defense act was enacted into law. It is undoubtedly the most efficient military legislation that ever passed the Congress of the United States. Since, however, our War Department had expanded but little during a period of 20 years or more, many of the features of the national-defense act were experimental in their nature. It was untried when we became engaged in the great conflict, and as a matter of course many defects were discovered in its operation. The national-defense act was never intended to fix the permanent organization of the military forces of the United States. It was largely a war measure, so it therefore became the duty of your Committee on Military Affairs to draft a measure that would provide for the permanent Military Establishment. After a careful study it decided that the better way to fulfill this object was to amend the present law rather than to draft a new one, and that is what this measure does. It contains some radical departures from our present law, but the fundamentals remain the same. In other words, it has been the aim of this committee to retain all of value in the national-defense act and amend it so as to obliterate the defects.

This measure does something that was never before attempted in a military bill. It absolutely prescribes the number of commissioned and enlisted men that shall compose the Regular Army. Under this bill the total enlisted strength will be 290,000 men, and the commissioned personnel will consist of 17,820 officers. This is the first time in the history of the Army that any Military Affairs Committee has stated definitely just

how many men may comprise the Military Establishment of the United States. Heretofore there has always been an "if" attached to every bill. As a result no committee has ever been able to compute the annual cost of maintaining the Army. Our personnel has been variable, and our appropriations had to be the same in order to meet any possible contingency. Under this bill we will know just exactly how many men we can have and just how much money it is going to cost us to maintain the same. If we accomplish this one object, it will be a notable achievement. While the total strength has been designated, the bill provides for a flexibility of the various organizations which will correct a long-standing defect. Hitherto all measures passed by Congress have made a definite provision for the organization of the various branches and tactical units. The number of units have been designated and the number of enlisted and commissioned men for each unit have been prescribed. No allowance was made for the changed conditions that might occur, and thus we had an Army so organized that it was impossible to meet any emergency that might arise. The present law does away with all this.

It places this power entirely in the hands of the President, and he may change the various organizations as conditions might demand. A simple illustration will emphasize the point. We have a regiment stationed in China and another on the Mexican border. The duties of the regiment in China are largely administrative, and the duties of the regiment on the Mexican border are largely that of guarding our frontier. In order to properly perform the work many more officers are needed for the regiment in China than are needed with the regiment on the Mexican border. But under the present law the number of officers and the number of enlisted men composing each regiment were necessarily the same. As a result the regiment in China does not have sufficient officers to do the work and has a surplus of enlisted men, while the regiment on the Mexican border has more officers than are needed and is short of enlisted men. Under this measure, however, the President of the United States may assign as many officers as he sees fit to the regiment in China, and he may assign as many enlisted men as he sees fit to the regiment on the Mexican border, providing, of course, that he keeps within the limit prescribed by the bill. Thus you will see the bill gives the Military Establishment the right to use its officers and enlisted men where they are most needed. It provides a workable organization not bound down by the ironclad rules that have hitherto made our Army so cumbersome and so hard to function.

It is true that the number of officers is increased over those prescribed in the national-defense act. This is occasioned, however, by the fact that the number of officers in the Army has steadily decreased in proportion to the enlisted force, and we are only now building our commissioned personnel to its former status. In 1850 the Army of the United States was composed of 10 commissioned men to every 100 enlisted men; in 1854 this was reduced to 7 commissioned officers to every 100 enlisted men; in 1874 this was increased to 9 commissioned officers to every 100 enlisted men; in 1898, during the Spanish-American War, the number of commissioned officers was decreased to 4 officers to every 100 enlisted men; in 1903 it was again increased to 6 commissioned officers to every 100 enlisted men; and in 1917 at the outbreak of the late war the number of commissioned officers in the United States Army was only 3 to every 100 enlisted men, while at the present time the number of commissioned officers is 4.26 to every 100 enlisted men. Under this bill the number of officers will be 6 to every 100 enlisted men. You will see, therefore, that we are only increasing our commissioned personnel to the status that it occupied in 1903, and that there will be fewer commissioned officers in proportion to the number of enlisted men than occurred in the Army on various previous occasions; thus while it increases the commissioned personnel a small percentage over the present number, under this bill everyone can be utilized in the place that he is most needed; while under the old inflexible method we had officers in some of the units who were superfluous, while other units were sadly lacking commands.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

I wish briefly to call your attention to another notable feature in this bill, and that is the one on page 14, section 5A, which provides "that in addition to such other duties as may be assigned him by the Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of War, under direction of the Secretary of War, shall be charged with supervision of the procurement of all military supplies and other business of the War Department pertaining thereto." In my judgment this one section, if enacted into law, will result in the saving of many millions of dollars to the Government. Our present system of obtaining supplies for the Military Establishment is one of the most inefficient and cumbersome methods that could possibly be conceived. It is wasteful, extravagant, un-



businesslike, and demoralizing. Hitherto each bureau of the War Department has been bidding against another bureau where the needs were identical. Instead of having one big business organization working in unison, we have had in this one department of the Government several minor organizations, each competing with the other in order to obtain supplies; none of them cooperate with the other in securing the same, and all of them buy without any consideration of what might be obtained from the other branches.

How long would a big department store in any of our busy cities last if each department was bidding against the other for the supplies it needed? Would anyone consider it a good business proposition if such a thing should occur? But that is just exactly what has been taking place in the War Department. If the Ordnance Department needed supplies for its men it went out into the open market to compete against the Quartermaster Department for the same. If the Engineer Department needed material it went out into the open market and competed against the Quartermaster Department for this same material. One was bidding against the other. If the Cavalry had an excess of a certain article and the Infantry was in need of that article it did not transfer from one department to the other, but the Cavalry procured what it needed while the excess in the hands of the Infantry was allowed to rot or depreciate in value. Thus you will see that a condition was created in the various departments of the Army that resulted in a large additional expense to the Government. Under this section of the act all this has been obviated. The Assistant Secretary of War is the chief through whose hands must go all the purchasing of these military supplies. He will be able, and should be able, to know just exactly what is on hand in the various departments. If one department has an excess and another department a deficit of the same material he has the authority to transfer the supplies needed from the department who has them to the department who has not. The necessities of the department will be procured in bulk.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman designate how the Assistant Secretary is to be appointed? Will he be of the Regular Establishment or a civilian?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. He will be a civilian, appointed by the Secretary of War, just as he is now. He will really be an Undersecretary of War.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is there any arrangement whereby in the handling of supplies there can be any more expeditious method of settling claims? For instance, I have a minister in my district who paid for some supplies at a sale made by the Quartermasters' Department last spring. He paid by check, and it was turned over to the officer in charge, and he held that the bid was not high enough to allow it to pass, and he turned the money into the Treasury, and the purchaser can neither get his goods nor money without an act of Congress. I have had the matter up for months, and this morning I got a notice to the effect that it would require an act of Congress to get that \$4.80 out of the Treasury. Are we going to obviate that sort of thing in this bill?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes. Practically every Member of Congress has had a similar experience. We think this bill will obviate that trouble.

The Secretary of War can buy the iron, steel, clothes, food, and fuel for the entire Army and distribute them as he sees fit. In giving him this power he will have the advantage of procuring in large quantities; there will be a unity in procurement and there will be no competition in the Army organization.

It will also be the province of the Assistant Secretary of War to expand and develop our great arsenals, and I think it is the greatest factor in our military progress. Approximately all of the necessities of the War Department can be manufactured in our arsenals, and this can be done approximately 40 per cent cheaper on a labor and raw-material basis than it can be purchased in the open market. Also, while we are securing the supplies for the Military Establishment much cheaper than we could by buying the same, we are developing our arsenals so that they will be at the highest point of efficiency in case of emergency. The Assistant Secretary of War under the wide latitude given him can manufacture in small quantities all the latest designs in warfare. He can keep abreast of the times, so to speak, and have on hand a nucleus from which could be developed in a short time all the neces-

sary modern implements of war. It is my opinion that the Assistant Secretary of War should, as soon as possible, manufacture and keep on hand all the necessary machinery, tools, jigs, dies, and so forth, that we would need to supply private industry if it suddenly became incumbent upon it to turn out its maximum capacity of war supplies. Under this system also each arsenal will keep employed a considerable body of men who will become efficient in their work and a great Government asset if an emergency should arise. I believe too much stress can not be placed on this development of the Government arsenals, and I think it should be clearly brought to the mind of the Assistant Secretary of War that he not only has the opportunity but it is incumbent upon him in his official position to see that the arsenals are properly developed as here outlined.

This bill provides for the complete reorganization of the National Guard and gives it the place in the great citizen soldiery of the United States to which it properly belongs. The departure from the national defense act is very radical, in that it places as chief of the National Guard a National Guard officer. This was done to stimulate interest in the organization and do away with the sentiment that the National Guard hitherto has had no opportunity to assume its proper position in the Military Establishment of the Government. Prior to this time the Chief of the Militia Bureau has been a West Point graduate, an officer who has viewed the National Guard through the perspective of the Regular Army officer, and, rightly or wrongly, it has been the general belief that the National Guard has been retarded in its development on this account. With this provision the chief executive of the National Guard will be a man who will be in entire sympathy with this organization and, therefore, give it an opportunity for utmost development. While the chief is a militiaman, however, the assistants in his office will be Regular Army officers who will be acquainted with all the tactical information necessary, and thus, while the guard will have at its head a man who is in sympathy with its development, it will also be supplied with all the detailed information required in order that it may assume its proper position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. How is this chief selected?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. He is appointed by the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or without?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. With confirmation by the Senate. It is an Executive appointment.

The purpose of this act is to provide a small standing Army sufficient to provide for the ordinary military needs of the United States, a National Guard that can be depended upon for a strong second line of defense, and an enlisted Reserve Corps which would be a large reservoir of trained men sufficient to meet the needs of any emergency. With this object in view, the National Guard was reorganized as provided in this bill.

The President has the power to designate the location of the divisions and the different tactical units. An incentive is offered to every young man in the United States to be a member of this organization. The bill provides for a three-year enlistment and training that will give every young man the necessary military information vital to him in time of a conflict. At the same time it gives him that freedom of action that could not possibly be provided for any man who enlisted in the Regular Army. It is the happy medium between unpreparedness and militarism, and in my opinion it is one of the most important provisions of this bill. After the young man has served his enlistment in the National Guard he is given an opportunity to enlist in the Reserve Corps, and by this proviso the guard will retain a large proportion of its men to be utilized in case of necessity. The bill also provides for adequate compensation for the officers of the National Guard and makes an incentive for these men to become proficient along military lines. Another very important provision is the one which provides for the permanency of the organization. The present war only emphasized the temporary organization under which the National Guard was constructed prior to that time. When the former enlisted force of the National Guard was drafted into the Regular Army the Guard was entirely obliterated, and when our demobilization was completed we awoke to the fact that we had no citizen organization. Under the present measure the soldier who enlists in the National Guard and is called into the Regular Army in time of emergency reverts back to his former organization after the emergency is over. I apprehend that under this measure the National Guard units will be organized in practically every town and hamlet in the United States, and that within a few years we will have a citizen organization that will be ample provision in any contingency that might arise.



Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the time that the National Guard man serves in the Regular forces during combat be counted in the three-year enlistment in the National Guard?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly; I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the bill limit the number of men in the National Guard in each congressional district?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There is no limit as to the number of men to be in the National Guard. Of course, that is regulated by the national-defense act, and the minimum is supposed to be 800 men for every Representative or Senator that we have. That was to be filled up by annual increments of 200 each year from passage of act in 1916. The only limit is as to the appropriations both by the National Government and by the States. The States always provide the armories.

Mr. RAMSEYER. So that the limitation on the growth of the National Guard will be the appropriations by Congress and those that the States are willing to make for that purpose?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes. That is all the limitation there is.

The bill, with a few necessary exceptions, provides for single-line promotions in the commissioned personnel. There has been no more needed change in the War Department within the last 20 years. The present system of lineal promotion is detrimental to a well-balanced military establishment. The personal equation is too strong a factor in the problem. Under the present plan an officer's promotion depended in a large measure on the expansion of that branch of the Army to which he was attached. As a result every officer had an eye single to the expansion of the organization to which he belonged, usually to the detriment of some other branch of the service. The effect of this condition has been to create jealousy in the various branches and to bring pressure to bear upon Congress to expand certain military units out of all proportion to their importance. Under the proposed plan no officer can derive personal benefit from the expansion of any particular branch. It will be to his advantage to see that the entire military organization has a normal growth and that each department assumes its proper position in the military unit, for his promotion will not depend upon the growth of any one branch but upon the growth of the entire Army. If this section is adopted, we will not in the future, as we have in the past, be compelled to witness the spectacle of Army officers bombarding the Members of Congress in an effort to have that particular branch of the service to which they belong given special preference simply because such preference means that they are going to receive a higher rank thereby.

A separate Air Service is established in this bill, and the initial steps are thereby taken giving to that branch of the service its proper place in the War Department. The Air Service is yet in its infancy, and I have no doubt but what it is capable of wonderful expansion. My personal opinion is that the creation of a separate service as herein provided should be followed by the bill which will create a department of aeronautics and place the entire procurement, designing, and manufacture of aeroplanes under a civilian head. I have already introduced a bill to that effect in Congress, and I would request that at your convenience you give it your careful attention with a view to develop aeronautics.

This bill places the Chemical Warfare Service in a separate bureau, and I think this should be done. Chemical warfare is a child of the late war and, while it is yet in its infancy, it was clearly demonstrated that it is one of the future factors in any great conflict. There is no other branch of the Army that has greater possibilities, possibilities that no one can foresee. If we are to keep abreast of the world in military preparedness, we must develop our Chemical Warfare Service. Not only can it be developed as a destructive branch of the War Department, but can also be developed as a constructive feature of the Government. I have been reliably informed that experiments are even now being conducted at our big Chemical Warfare Service plant in Edgewood which give great possibilities to revolutionize not only our present mode of warfare but some of the peace-time pursuits. For this reason I deem it advisable to give Chemical Warfare Service an opportunity to expand.

Your committee decided that it would be unwise to incorporate universal military training in this bill. In my judgment, it was a wise decision. No satisfactory universal military training system has yet been advanced either by the Members of Congress or by the War Department. All have been more or less speculative in their character. An estimate of the expense

attached to these proposed bills has varied from \$130,000,000 to \$1,300,000,000. I think the decision to appoint a committee which will investigate thoroughly and present some concrete measure to your committee is an excellent idea. Universal military training is a question that, if enacted into law, will change the entire military policy of the United States and necessarily the policy of the War Department. In my opinion, a measure of such importance should not be tacked onto this reorganization bill, which is simply an amendment to the national defense act. It should be presented to Congress as a separate measure, so that it can be considered solely on its own merits. The highest officials in the War Department have advised that even if universal military training were adopted as a policy of the Government at the present time, it could not be placed in operation before 1922 or 1923. By the time we could actually carry out the provisions of any measure we might pass now, conditions might so change that the bill would be impractical. It seems to me, therefore, that any universal military training policy that the Government might decide upon should be enacted into law by the Congress which sits in session immediately prior to the time it is to be placed in actual operation.

Section 27, page 38, of the bill is one of the most important clauses in the entire measure. It goes a long way toward solving the problem of military training. The section is very brief. It provides as follows:

Hereafter original enlistments in the Regular Army shall be for a period of one year and of three years at the option of the soldier. Re-enlistment shall be for a period of three years.

In brief, this section provides for one-year enlistments, and it eliminates the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Regular Army. Under this provision any young man in the United States may enlist for a period of 12 months and then return to private life. The result of this feature, in my opinion, will be that a very much larger proportion of the young men of the United States will seek military service in the Regular Army. Heretofore anyone who desired to become attached to the Army had to tie himself up for a period of three years of active service, with the proviso that he might be called upon at any time for four years longer. In other words, he was practically bound by his military pledge for the period of seven years. No young man with any ambition would subject himself to such a condition. The result has been that instead of the ranks of our Regular Army being filled with young men we have had in most all instances the minimum instead of the maximum quota. Indeed, it has been a deplorable fact that the various units in our Army have been skeleton units, a paper Army, so called, and rightly named because we could not secure the required number of men. Now, however, with the prospects of one year's military training and no strings tied to the same, an inducement is offered for the youths of the land to secure military training. With this increased enlistment and short-term service there will constantly flow back into private life a large body of young men who have had their year's service, become trained soldiers, and who will form a large reservoir of military trained men who can be called upon in any emergency. That my predictions will come true is clearly demonstrated by what has occurred within the last year. If you will recall, last year a clause was passed which provided that one-third of the Army could be made up of one-year enlistments. As soon as this became generally known there was immediately a large increase in the number of enlisted men, a very large proportion of which enlisted for one year. In fact, this reached its maximum last January, when the number of one-year enlistments became so great that the entire quota had been secured under law, and the result was the War Department could accept no more for the short period. Immediately following enlistments decreased a very large per cent, which was a practical demonstration of the fact that men will enter the Army for a short period, but will not obligate themselves for a period of years. I have no hesitancy in saying that if this measure is properly operated, in a few years a very large per cent of our young men will have had a one-year service and will have become trained soldiers.

We have no way of making any accurate estimate, but it is fair to assume that a minor proportion of these one-year enlisted men will decide to make service in the Army their vocation, and will therefore, upon the termination of their first enlistment, re-enlist in the Army. Thus, besides building up a strong military reserve, this system will have the advantage of providing for the Regular Army a large number of young men who desire to continue therein from choice. It is only fair to assume that these men will be able to form the backbone of our enlisted Army, and they will provide the necessary number to keep that organization to its maximum strength.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit right there to another question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; certainly.



Mr. RAMSEYER. Is the one-year enlistment absolute or at the discretion of the officer?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If a man wants to go in, he comes under the other regulations. He can go in for one year or for three years.

Mr. RAMSEYER. And then at the end of that year—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. He can go out.

Mr. RAMSEYER. How long does he stay in the reserves?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. He is not in the reserves. He can enlist for three years or one year, but he can not reenlist for one year.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If he serves three years or one year, he can not reenlist except for three years?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; in either case. If he serves for one year, he can not reenlist for one year.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. DONOVAN. I understand by the provisions of the bill that if a man enlists for one year, if he reenlists it must be for three years. If he reenlists again, the third reenlistment, that must be for three years.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Every period of enlistment is for a period of three years.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; all reenlistments are for three years under this bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GRIFFIN. What impelled the committee to put that limit of reenlistment at three years? It would seem that if men are allowed to enlist for one year, that it would be of benefit to have the reenlistment for one year.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely right; having had some experience in getting one-year enlistments I think we have taken an advanced step when we put it in the bill as it is, and I am satisfied. The gentleman will remember that we got in one-third of one-year enlistments a year ago. I understand that the Regular Army is averse to a one-year enlistment. They fight it, and they have always fought it, because they do not believe in it. In doing this much the Military Committee is not following the advice of the Regular Army; they are trying to take an advanced step and to see how it works in filling up the Army.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If you allow men to reenlist for one year, your chances to keep the force up to its standard would be materially enhanced.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is it not easier to get men to reenlist for one year than for three years?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think so.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. I understood the gentleman to state that the officers of the Army have always opposed one-year enlistments. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not believe, from a purely military standpoint, that the position of the Army officers as to one-year enlistment is sound.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. No; I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. If we are going to have an efficient Army, we can have a much better one if the men serve three years than we can if they serve one. Is not that true?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not think it is; I do not agree with the gentleman and never have on the one-year enlistment.

Mr. DONOVAN. The point raised is a very interesting one, and I was wondering whether a one-year enlistment was upon certain grounds. I was just conversing with one of my colleagues, and he said that he understands the theory is that the Regular Army being now the object of the bill, they want to educate and train as great a number of men throughout the country as possible, and the one-year men will come in and pass out and new men will come in, and therefore a greater number of men will be trained.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is the idea of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAWLEY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. During the Napoleonic wars, Napoleon, after having crushed Prussia, prevented Prussia from having a larger standing army than 20,000. In order to train as many men as possible, Prussia called a new set of men to the colors every six months. Is not that true?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes. It was Stein who used the plan at that time to train all Germans, although he could only train 20,000 at one time.

Mr. KNUTSON. And in a few years she regained her military prestige?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why would not that same system work in this country?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It would. The idea is not new at all.

Briefly I have outlined the more important measures contained in this bill. It is not a perfect piece of legislation. If conditions were different there are some features that I would eliminate and some to which I would add. This, however, can be done from time to time as our military policy develops, and it can be done much more efficiently than now. This bill, however, is constructive. It is a long step forward in the development of a well-balanced and efficient War Department; it gives opportunity for those new features of warfare that were discovered in the late conflict to expand, and it stabilizes the military system on which our War Department is founded. I wish also to point out to you what will occur if this bill is defeated. The War Department at the present time is functioning almost entirely under the draft law which was passed May 18, 1917, the Overman Act, and the act of last September allowing the President to retain temporarily 18,000 officers. Very soon after peace is declared these acts, on account of their temporary nature, will lapse and the War Department will then necessarily function under the old national defense act. If this bill fails of passage there will be no separate Air Service, there will be no separate Chemical Warfare Service, there will be no separate finance department, there will be no efficient National Guard in the United States, there will be a very inefficient and badly demoralized Transport Corps, there will be no one-year enlistments, and the Army will revert back to the skeleton organizations without sufficient number of enlisted men to function; in fact, there will be no Army. Should this bill fail to pass the General Staff will occupy the same position of absolute power as it does at the present time. The various bureaus instead of being allowed to function properly, as they have been under peace-time rules, will be still restricted to war-time practices. If this bill fails of passage the whole fabric of our military policy will be demoralized. I can not therefore urge upon you too strongly to support this bill and see that it is enacted into law.

The principal argument against this bill is that it entails too great an expense. I believe, however, that it calls for a minimum expenditure necessary for a proficient Army, and it is more economical to appropriate this sum and secure efficiency than a less sum which would result in inefficiency only. The expense involved is only the insurance necessary for our national protection. As insurance this measure calls for one-sixth of 1 per cent of our entire national wealth. It is the price we have to pay for the protection of our property, our lives, and our national honor. Our military system is the bulwark of our national defense and on its efficiency or inefficiency we must stand or fall. In writing this measure your committee had but one thought in mind, the organization and maintenance of an efficient military system at the least possible cost to its citizens. It should, and I sincerely hope will, receive the support of every Member of this House. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GREENE of Vermont having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Richmond, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to amend a certain paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved February 14, 1920.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3696) to change the time for holding court in Laurinburg, eastern district of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 12164. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River between the towns of Pasco and Kennewick, in the State of Washington; and

H. R. 12213. An act authorizing F. R. Beals to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Nestucca River, in Tillamook County, Ore.



## TO AMEND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the national defense act was enacted June 3, 1916, and this country entered the Great War on April 6, 1917. In the short interval between June 3, 1916, and the succeeding April the country was engaged with the Mexican border troubles, which according to precedents then existing were real warfare. Of course, as compared with the later events the disturbed border conditions were too insignificant to be considered as producing war conditions. The national defense act therefore has never been really tried out as a peace-time proposition for an Army.

It served, however, an excellent purpose, and in spite of the jealousy of the Regular Army, gave us the nucleus of an Army which finally developed into a most effective branch of the service, and on the battle fields of France did glorious work.

The principles of the national defense act, roughly stated, are:

First line of defense: The Regular Army.

Second line of defense: The National Guard, consisting of State troops.

Third line of defense: The unorganized militia, which under the selective draft law were speedily mobilized.

Virginians served in all these branches, and either in the regular divisions or in the Twenty-ninth Division, formed out of the National Guard units, or in the Eightieth Division, formed from the selective draft units, rendered deeds of glory on many blood-stained battle fields.

There can be no question, as has been so often stated on this floor, that when the war broke in its fury upon this country the country was wholly unprepared for such a great emergency. The national-defense act, supplemented by the selective-draft law, could furnish us the man power, but we were wholly without the means of utilizing the man power.

We had no guns, no canvas for tents, no housing facilities, no supplies. We had a wholly insufficient number of trained officers, and, of course, the man power to a very limited number were trained.

We did not even have the raw material in supply nor the factory to convert the raw material into required product.

The whole character of warfare, too, had been changed by the methods of this war.

The aerial bomb, the poisoned-gas shell, the airship, motor transportation, the submarine, great batteries of artillery, the hand grenade, the machine gun and automatic rifle, trench tactics, the manipulation of armies of millions of men presented problems entirely new, which had to be mastered without loss of time.

Such was the situation this country faced when war was declared to exist, and I can not forbear a moment's digression to pay a tribute to the people and their chosen leaders.

When the fiery cross sped across the land summoning the manhood and womanhood to the colors the response was a magnificent tribute to American patriotism. Down from the mountains, up from the valleys, rolling over the plains, out from the crowded streets of cities and the marts of trade came the answer of an aroused democracy, as millions of men gathered to the colors and millions of women set themselves to their appointed tasks.

All were mustered into the service. The captains of industry, the kings of finance, the union labor and the nonunion labor man, the rich and the poor, shoulder to shoulder, lent every energy to the great task. I have visited the scenes of American activities, and no one without visualizing the marvelous results can form any proper conception of the work done. In the spring of 1917 America entered the war wholly unprepared; in the fall of 1918 she had crossed the sea, in spite of the submarine, with a mighty army and converted threatened disaster of her allies into a great American victory. [Applause.]

The Army, the Secretary of War, and all of his assistants are entitled to the everlasting gratitude of the American people. It has become the fashion on the Republican side to pour out virulent criticism upon the head of the Secretary of War, but criticism of the Secretary is necessarily criticism of our brave soldiers, who were charged with the duty of executing the plans of the War Department.

I know that this is the day of investigating committees, smelling committees, junketing committees of all kinds and character, and this is what the Republican leaders are giving the people instead of constructive legislation. The exigencies of a presidential election campaign demand poisoned gas, the noisy beating of tom-toms, and the smashing of stinkpots, but the more resort that is had to assaults of this kind on the able Secretary

of War the greater attention is directed to the marvelous work done under his leadership. If he is to be held accountable for errors committed, he is entitled to results obtained, and above the fumes of partisan malice towers the great American victory to his credit. The able and patriotic man, who during the trying period of this war so faithfully served his people, need only to point to that as a complete answer to every detractor. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I return to the problem that now confronts this House, which is the bill for the Military Establishment in time of peace.

If we are to be given a great Military Establishment; if we introduce as a part of our program compulsory military service in time of peace, then we rob the American people of the great victory won at the expense of so much precious blood and treasure. The American people will never stand for a great professional Army, carrying a billion or more dollars annual burden on the taxpayers, with its attendant compulsory service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. The gentleman who undertook to explain the bill [Mr. ANTHONY] stated that it was his understanding that this Army was not for the purpose of defending ourselves against external aggression, but it was to defend ourselves against ourselves—internal trouble.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, in that case, I think we can cut down the Army very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Down to 175,000, does not the gentleman think?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; we can reduce the Army, but I think we should have a nucleus around which one could be built up. I shall develop that later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman think 300,000 is too much of an Army for such a purpose?

Mr. HARRISON. It is a large army; it is certainly an adequate army. I know no distinction between compulsory service and compulsory military training. In some great quarters a distinction is made between the two, but the Constitution of our fathers draws no such distinction. The training of the militia by the express terms of the Constitution is reserved to the States, and the only other power in the Constitution is to "raise and support armies." It is under this power that the selective draft operated, and it is only under this power that an American citizen, I do not care whether he is 18 or 21, can be taken from his home and from his fireside, from his study, from his work, and be placed in a camp.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman have in mind that we have as our basic policy compulsory universal service in time of war.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. The gentleman is aware of that. What the gentleman means is that he would not compel the boys or men of America to do anything by compulsion in peace times.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the people are getting mighty sick of this compulsory business of all kinds and character. [Applause.]

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman advocate some other military policy for war time?

Mr. HARRISON. No. I am in favor of military draft in war time. I am in favor of the military draft whenever war is declared, because I think a duty then rests on every American citizen to defend his country, but during the time of peace the point I am making is that we have no constitutional authority to take these men for educational purposes.

Mr. SANFORD. The point is that we shall rely on compulsory service in time of war, but must do nothing in time of peace to prepare the men to carry out that obligation?

Mr. HARRISON. My point is that we must stand by the Constitution. I admit that by taking these boys into the Army and making them a constituent element of the Army we can train them, and that is what has been done in these several bills and measures that have been proposed. I made this very point before the joint committee, and I notice that all recent legislative propositions avoid the constitutional difficulty by placing the boys in the Army as constituent elements of the same.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. As I understand, the gentleman takes the position that if a universal military training bill is enacted by Congress and an effort be made to enforce it, that it would be unconstitutional?

Mr. HARRISON. It would be unconstitutional unless the Wadsworth bill and these recent legislative propositions that are



now pending were adopted; that is, putting these boys into the service. The States can enact compulsory educational laws, but Congress can not. The training of the militia also is expressly reserved to the States. Congress can only raise and support armies.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. And therefore the individual and the State would be within their rights if they refused to comply with the law? Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; unless the youth is inducted in the Army. I will point that out. This is a feature of the Wadsworth bill which was incorporated; that is, making the boy a part of the Military Establishment. He is inducted into the service by the Wadsworth bill, and that was the proposition that was before our committee, to take these 18-year-old boys and induct them into the service.

It is true that the language of the bill is that they shall be used only for training purposes; but when you take one of these boys into the military service you subject him to military law and make him subject to every military duty. If an emergency should arise, we all know that the first thing that would be done would be to order these boys into active military duty. Gentlemen, do you suppose for one moment the young men in the camps for training purposes would, in case of war, be demobilized? They would be ordered into active service, and they would have to obey or face a firing squad. Men in military service obey the orders of their superior officers, and not legislative enactments. The President, and not Congress, under the Constitution is Commander in Chief, and these young men could be ordered, in case of war, to any quarter of the globe. The young men, too, would be subject to military law. For any frivolity they could be court-martialed. Do you recall "Hard-boiled" Smith? Study some of the court-martial records and ask yourselves if you desire to expose your son or the son of your neighbor to brutal court-martial judgments for some boyish prank. This is what the Wadsworth bill means.

The cost of this proposition will be enormous. I know that the Army statisticians are around with their figures, but no one with any common sense is going to be deceived by any juggling with figures. These young men will have to be housed, and the war cantonment buildings, unpainted, built of the flimsiest stuff, are already rotting to the ground. The reconstruction would call for an initial expenditure running into the hundreds of millions at the present cost of material and labor, and an annual outlay for maintenance of millions more.

These young men called into the service will have to be fed. We know the number of men called each year would be at least 700,000, and that a dollar a day would be a cheap sum to allow for the subsistence of each one; \$700,000 a day for six months would be a meager allowance just for food. I know the Wadsworth bill fixes four months, but this is mere camouflage. Gen. March testified that, while only four months was asked, he did it for the simple purpose of getting the country committed to the policy, and then the country would be willing to see that the length of service would be adequate. I do not believe myself six would be adequate to imbue into a young man any real military spirit or discipline his character. We must reflect conditions in the cantonments will be very different in peace time from what they were in war time.

The young man who went into camp at that time was preparing for the immediate emergency of the battle field. He knew he would be called on in the near future to face danger and death and his life would be the price of his unpreparedness. In peace time the natural exuberance of youth would be rather to shirk as far as possible the drudgery and dreariness of military discipline. It would take time and patience to inculcate in him any love of a work of such a character as this, and, in my judgment, not even six months would be sufficient time. Especially would this be the case when the young man would know that the occupation was of a temporary character.

It does not mean any reduction in the Army. The testimony before the Military Committee was to the effect that the size of the Army would have to be increased in order to furnish the men to train these raw recruits, and it is admitted, I believe, on all sides that so far from bringing about a reduction of the Army, if you adopt military training you will have to increase the size of this Army. The young man would have to be clothed and his health would have to be looked after. Then, too, there would be claims for compensation for injuries sustained in the service. Any reflecting man will at once realize the immense cost of such a program and will not be deceived by figures cooked up for the purpose. When the cost of a system of preparedness is as great a burden on industry as a state of war, then a cheaper method of preparedness should be sought.

In the South we have the negro problem. I have the greatest kindness toward the negro, as all thinking southern men have. Booker Washington, their leader and father, advocated that the proper training for the negro boy was to educate him to save money and to earn money in productive work. Now, I know nothing so irresponsible as a young negro boy rigged out in brass buttons and with a gun. In communities where the negro largely predominates he would be a positive menace to the safety of that community. The South has taken hold of the negro problem with great earnestness and under a heavy tax burden in endeavoring to educate him. The negro contributes practically nothing to this burden. The southern people are desirous of extending sympathetic aid to his development along all practical lines. The existence of the South depends upon such a policy. The negro is not adapted to a military career and training along this line would utterly unfit him for the economic place he now fills. To take a negro boy from the plow or the cotton field, where he is gradually developing pecuniary independence and fill his head full of the military display and put a gun in his keeping would be a crime against him and his State.

In communities where the negro population largely predominates such an experiment would be a positive menace to the safety of that community. In rural communities, if not in urban, the question of labor has become greatly aggravated. It is all the farmer can now do, with the assistance of his sons, to keep the farm in cultivation. To take his son away at an impressionable age will greatly accentuate his labor troubles. I speak of the farmer, with whose situation I am most familiar, but I believe it will be found equally true of other callings. I well remember that when it was proposed to draft into the Army the 18-year-old boys many schools and colleges prepared to close their institutions. It is said that this military education will be of great advantage to him. In war times it may be that camp training under religious and other wholesome influences helped the young men, but I have great doubts about the camp in peace times. Near cities, as these camps are, it is more likely to be demoralizing. I never heard that a peace-time camp was a Sunday school, and I doubt if it ever will be. There is no more wholesome place for a youth to be than in his Christian American home. But if improvement of the boy is sought, give the money to the public schools and higher education for both sexes. Build good roads with it. I know of no greater evangel of civilization in a community than a good road.

Another irritating feature of the compulsory training would be the perpetuation of the local boards of exemption, with their annual irritating contests. In war these boards, assisted by local lawyers, rendered great patriotic service fearlessly and patriotically and unselfishly, but I fear the temptation of peace. When these boards get into operation in peace times the temptation will be to use the contests before them for political purposes. And otherwise it would be a constant source of irritation to try the contests in a community each year as to who should be exempted and who should not be exempted by these boards.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is peculiarly an unfortunate time to attempt such an experiment. We are facing a deficit of three to five billion dollars, with large claims by the war veterans for consideration not included. The industry of the country is carrying as great a burden of taxation as it can carry and live. We have 4,000,000 trained men in the country, from whom, by volunteering, all the trained officers for a large army can be obtained. It is not so much the trained enlisted man as the trained officer. There are on file 25,000 applications for commissions by splendid young trained ex-officers, and therefore it seems peculiarly unnecessary to saddle this extra burden on the country.

Mr. Chairman, there are many of the features of this bill I indorse. It starts basically on the right principle, and that is the amendment of the national defense act. It goes back to the principles upon which that bill was founded. I am in hearty sympathy with the provision of the bill which provides for a large number of trained officers. I believe that when the history of this war is written the errors that were committed and the losses that occurred arose more from a lack of having trained officers than from a lack of trained enlisted men.

There is some criticism that has been indulged in upon this floor upon the West Point men and the Leavenworth men and the others from special schools, but I believe when we examine into the fact we will find that the American officer, whether he came from West Point or whether he came from Leavenworth or whether he came from civil life, discharged his full duty and that he is entitled not to criticism but to the thanks of the American people. [Applause.] I know there



are some of these men who did acts subjecting them to criticism, but you can not in a large number of men help finding some fools, and it is possible that some of these men did act in a foolish and silly manner, but the great number of American officers discharged a great duty to the American people. Some criticism has been thrown out about West Point men not getting to the front or Leavenworth men not getting to the front, but we all know an officer was desirous of going where military glory and opportunity awaited him and that he was detained in work that was trying and irksome in training raw material that had to be trained on this side before it was sent over.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is not it true—I will ask the gentleman from Virginia if it is not a fact—that in proportion just as many West Point graduates, regular military officers, and emergency officers went to France, and in proportion to an equal number who engaged in combat were killed and wounded?

Mr. HARRISON. I have never examined into the statistics, but I will answer for it that the American officer did his full duty wherever he was ordered to discharge it, and therefore I think that this criticism of these officers and these various schools are unjustified. I have no criticism to offer of this bill because it has a large number of unattached officers. I believe that we can secure all the benefits of military training by providing for military training in the public schools, in the military academies and colleges, and in training camps, and for my part I will always be willing to vote for a liberal appropriation. In that way we get training that will run through years, where under the compulsory military feature it is only for a few months. Then, again, the war has developed the fact that we need a number of new corps and new bureaus. Before the war, under the Signal Corps was the Air Service. Now the Air Service has far outgrown the Signal Corps. We also, in my judgment, need a construction corps, and I now ask to extend my remarks at this point to insert a letter from the Secretary of War strongly indorsing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

MARCH 5, 1920.

HON. JULIUS KAHN,  
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KAHN: An examination of a bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," now pending before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, discloses the fact that no provision is made either for a separate transportation service or for a separate construction service. In order that the position of the War Department, with reference to these two important branches of the service, may not be misunderstood, I beg to advise you that our judgment and experience dictates the wisdom of making provision for such services.

At a very early period in the World War it became necessary to take from the Quartermaster Corps and set up these two services into separate bureaus, reporting originally directly to the Secretary of War, because of the overburdened state of the responsibilities of the Quartermaster General.

In addition to the duties of supervising the transportation of the Army, the transportation service has recently been charged by the President with the supervision and operation of the inland waterways, recently under the charge of the Director General of Railroads. This activity includes the operation and maintenance of Government barge lines on the Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans, on the Warrior River from Birmingham to Mobile and New Orleans, and on the New York Barge Canal between Buffalo and New York.

It is to be noted that under the provisions of section 9 of the bill the Quartermaster General is charged (as appears at line 3, page 17) "with the direction of all work pertaining to the construction, maintenance, and repair of buildings, structures, and utilities connected with housing the officers and enlisted men of the Army, and with the storage and issue to the Army of quartermaster supplies." With this limitation of construction in the Quartermaster Corps it is apparent that it is the intention of the proposed bill that all construction, maintenance, and repair work other than housing of the Army and storing of quartermaster supplies is to be performed by the other bureaus and services of the War Department. This contemplates a return to the prewar conditions when each service and bureau of the War Department carried out its own construction, maintenance, and repair work. Each bureau, therefore, will be called upon to create within itself a distinct construction department, thereby giving encouragement to interdepartmental duplication and loss of economy.

It is therefore my respectful recommendation that in due consideration of this subject provision be made for a separate transportation service and a separate construction service in the proposed bill.

Respectfully, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,  
Secretary of War.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not agree with the gentlemen who have presented this bill, members of the committee, as to the limitation that is imposed upon the General Staff. I think that under the provisions of this bill the General Staff can operate with just as autocratic powers as it ever did, and the only way to reach that situation is to reduce the number of

officers who are to be included in the General Staff. We will have the same old thing that has been complained of here on this floor in the operation of the Army during the war by the General Staff, which not only took charge of the supervision of the various bureaus but actually discharged all of the functions of all of the bureaus, which I think would be very unfortunate. This bill creates further, in my judgment, a privileged and aristocratic class in the composition of the General Staff by limiting the qualifications of staff service without giving any other person even a look-in. The best General Staff officers that the Army ever had were men who could not fulfill the conditions which the bill imposes upon the membership of the General Staff.

I shall propose the following amendment or support an amendment of like character:

An amendment to H. R. 12775, to confine duties of the War Department General Staff to those of a general nature and to insure their not engaging in work of an administrative nature that pertains to established bureaus or offices of the War Department, and to make possible the detail of any capable officer for duty on the General Staff.

Omit so much of section 5, General Staff Corps, as is on page 10, 11, and the first 12 lines of page 12, and substitute therefor the following: "SEC. 5. General Staff Corps: The General Staff Corps shall consist of the Chief of Staff, the War Department General Staff, and the General Staff with troops. The War Department General Staff shall consist of the Chief of Staff and three assistants to the Chief of Staff selected by the President from the general officers of the line, and 44 other officers of grades not below that of captain. The General Staff with troops shall consist of such number of officers not below the grade of captain as may be necessary to perform the General Staff duties of the headquarters of territorial departments, armies, army corps, divisions, and brigades, and as military attachés abroad. In time of peace the detail of an officer as a member of the General Staff Corps shall be for a period of four years, unless sooner relieved: *Provided*, That no officer shall be detailed as a member of the General Staff Corps other than the Chief of Staff and the general officers herein provided for as assistants to the Chief of Staff, except upon the recommendation of a board of five officers not below the rank of colonel, who shall be selected by the President or the Secretary of War, and neither the Chief of Staff nor more than two other members of the General Staff Corps, nor any officer not a member of said corps who shall have been stationed or employed on any duty in or near the District of Columbia within one year prior to the date of convening of any such board, shall be detailed as a member thereof. No recommendation made by any such board shall, for more than one year after the making of such recommendation or at any time after the convening of another such board, unless again recommended by the new board, be valid as a basis for the detail of any officer as a member of the General Staff Corps; and no alteration whatever shall be made in any report or recommendation of any such board, either with or without the consent of members thereof, after the board shall have submitted such report or recommendation and shall have adjourned sine die. "The duties of the War Department General Staff shall be to prepare plans for the national defense and for the mobilization of the military forces and national resources in time of war; to investigate and report upon all questions affecting the efficiency of the Army and its state of preparation for military operations. Not to exceed six of the War Department General Staff officers will be assigned to the duty of coordinating the work of the various established bureaus of the War Department, and none of these officers nor any other General Staff officers will be detailed to or assigned to any of the various bureaus of the War Department, but will operate as a committee of coordination."

The national defense act provided the following complement of General Staff officers: One Chief of Staff, 2 generals, 10 colonels, 10 lieutenant colonels, 15 majors, and 17 captains, of which not to exceed one-half will be stationed in Washington. The proposed bill provides that the General Staff in Washington shall consist of 1 Chief of Staff, 4 generals, and 84 officers, which is almost double the number of the entire General Staff before the war, or four times the number stationed in Washington before the war.

This excessive number can only be used for administrative purposes and for the purpose of assuming supervision over the various established bureaus of the War Department, which the bill, in page 14, tries but fails to prevent.

It is well known to the many Members of the House that the General Staff performs administrative duties and exercises supervision and control over the various bureaus of the War Department, which cause excessive duplication of work and takes away from the bureau chiefs. The most striking example is that set up in the Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division, each officer actually accomplishing results and doing work is supervised by a General Staff officer, generally sitting alongside of him, tabulating what he does and checking up on him. There undoubtedly should be a committee of the General Staff on coordination, but this committee should sit together and coordinate the functions but make no attempt to harmonize them, such a detail as is at present attempted, in that they use this excuse of harmonization to actually control and minutely supervise every small purchase of operation that is being carried on.

The manner of selection of General Staff officers as written in the proposed bill would eliminate the initiative on the part of the large body of officers to become General Staff officers. The wording of the amendment throws open the door to the General Staff to every capable officer, and there are many capable officers who have not and will not have the chance to take the course in the General Staff College, as this must neces-



sarily be limited to a very small number. Many of the officers of the Army at large have, by their own efforts, studied and prepared themselves for General Staff work, and I believe that these officers should be eligible for detail in exactly the same manner as an officer who has been given the preference in taking the course at the Staff College. The amendment makes the selection of General Staff officers exactly as it was under the national defense act, and I believe this method to be far superior to the one in the proposed bill. The method in the proposed bill sets up a board by the Chief of Staff, under the Chief of Staff, to select these officers, and it practically amounts to a class distinction requiring certain certificates of graduation of an officer before making him eligible. This is entirely at variance from the principle of this country in which we consider all men equal and any man of ability available for any position.

Why should we limit the detail of a General Staff officer to a certain class any more than we should say that a man should not be elected to Congress unless he had at first served in a State legislature, or that a man should not be elected President unless he had first been governor of a State?

I fully indorse that provision of the bill which provides for an assistant secretary and gives him charge of supervising the supplies for the Army. It seems to me that is an exceedingly wise innovation. By taking the national-defense act and making the changes which are necessary to bring the organization of the Army to the present requirements of a modern army I believe we will have all the legislation necessary. We should preserve the National Guard, aiding the States in maintaining a proper military force for the enforcing of State laws, and at the same time having well-trained troops to be called on occasion into the Federal service. The proposed bill needs amendment, but it is on a correct basis. I believe we all, without regard to party, desire to reach a proper basis for securing an army for the national defense. I propose to vote on the propositions in connection with this bill absolutely and entirely free from party bias and I believe Members are animated by the same purpose. The sacrifices of thousands of men for the country on the blood-stained fields of France are still fresh in our thoughts, and the inspiration of their example will guide us to a consideration of this bill, animated solely by a purpose to safeguard American institutions and to secure the honor and glory of the American flag. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. How much time did the gentleman use?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield that back?

Mr. HARRISON. I will yield it back.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman on the other side use some time now?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO].

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Clerk to read in my time the following article from the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Press of March 7, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the article indicated. The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Press, Sunday, Mar. 7, 1920.]

HIGH COST OF LIVING CRACKING MORALE OF ARMY AND NAVY; OFFICERS RESIGNING.

WASHINGTON, March 6 (Special).

America's greatest military problem now is not the future size of her fighting forces, but retention of what she has.

The high cost of living, according to personnel officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, is doing to the American military forces what the German powers could not do. It is cracking the morale.

Wholesale resignations of officers in the regular service are pouring in, nearly one-fourth of all the officers in the Regular Army having submitted resignations since the armistice was signed.

In the Navy the resignations are proportionately as large and many warships are now tied up in navy yards because of an insufficient crew to take them to sea.

Resignations of temporary officers by the thousands was not only expected but desired as soon as the war ended, but no such exodus of men from the regular service as has occurred was anticipated.

Figures obtained at the War Department to-day show that there have been 2,354 resignations out of the Regular Establishment of less than 11,000 officers, and they are coming in great numbers daily.

Officers of the higher grades are not generally resigning, because the higher pay and additional allowances they receive enable them to meet the increased living expenses. More than half of the resignations from the Army are submitted by first lieutenants.

In discussion of relative rates of pay in civil and military life recently it was pointed out that the Army doctors at Walter Reed General Hospital, in Washington, were receiving less than the bricklayers at work on the hospital buildings there.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, while this bill makes no provision in itself for increased pay of officers, I think it not amiss at this time briefly to mention it specifically because of the fact that for several days statements have been made on the floor of this House protesting against any increase in the pay of the men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, in which figures

have been given which are entirely misleading. The statement was made the other day that it was proposed to expend more than \$80,000,000 for this purpose. I want to call attention to the fact that of the two bills which have been considered by the Senate and which have been pending on the Calendar of the House, one of them provides for an expenditure of \$49,000,000, and the other, in round numbers, for \$59,000,000.

Mr. QUIN. What item is that the gentleman is mentioning?

Mr. CRAGO. The matter of the proposition for increased pay of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and of the enlisted men.

Both of these bills are based, not on any attempt to get men into the Army, the Navy, and Marine Corps, but are both based on an attempt to keep in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps the men who have been trained and have become efficient.

Now, the article which has just been read is only a sample of articles which are in the better papers of this country, from one end of it to the other. You might say that it is part of a propaganda, but when you meet these men who are affected, as you do meet them as they travel on the trains, going to and from their homes, you know that what they say is not a part of any propaganda. Only a few days ago on the train I talked with two young men who had just left their ship in New York Harbor and were going to their homes in St. Louis. Those men were skilled mechanics, electricians, on that ship. They had each spent some fourteen to sixteen years in the service of the Navy. Both of them were married. Their wives lived in St. Louis. They got the magnificent pay, I believe, of \$77 per month, and each of them was going home with the intention of quitting the service, because their term of enlistment had expired, and they said that they owed it to their families to get into something where they could make two or three or four times the money. And yet these are the very type of men our Nation must have if we are to successfully operate the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not a fact that the House passed a bill raising the pay of the enlisted men?

Mr. CRAGO. Of the Navy, yes. Now, it is eminently unfair to increase the pay of a class of men in the Navy and not increase the pay of the same class of men in the Army, as the Army requires practically as many expert men in the noncommissioned personnel as the Navy.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the gentleman was directing his remarks to commissioned officers.

Mr. CRAGO. It starts with the enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps the minute they have started up the line for promotion. For instance, the first-class private in the Army gets it. As to the cost of this, if you will repeal the provisions of the Overman Act and do away with the frills and follies which are being carried out to-day at immense cost in this country in the name of Army training, you will save two or three times as much during the coming year as it will take to pay this increase, and I am referring to the so-called war-camp activities which are going on and which cost this Government millions of dollars each year, and which are entirely unessential. They are merely carrying out some man's fad as to a particular line of training.

Mr. MADDEN. How much does the gentleman say this will cost?

Mr. CRAGO. The provision of the two bills, as I explained to the gentleman, one bill costs \$49,000,000 and the other approximately \$59,000,000. I refer to the 10 per cent increase for the officers and the ration increase, and the increase for the enlisted personnel.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood the total was about \$80,000,000 a year.

Mr. CRAGO. The figures we have from the Bureau of Finance show \$59,000,000 for the one bill—

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman says that if the Overman Act was repealed it would save four times the amount. Does the gentleman mean to say it would save \$300,000,000?

Mr. CRAGO. I think it would. But that is merely an estimate. Everywhere you go you see the immense expenditures that are being made under no other authority of law than the provisions of the Overman Act. Again, if you take the surplus material in the hands of the War Department and the Navy Department to-day and dispose of that material without thinking more of what the result of it will be on decreasing the prices on the general market, and think more of the fact that the Government needs this money, and that the goods are constantly deteriorating, you will realize more than enough in the next six months to pay all this expense. You can go to one aviation warehouse in Buffalo alone and dispose of enough surplus material, which is deteriorating more or less, and inside of the next three months, although you may break the market price on some of the necessities of life in doing that, and on some of the



material that is very much in demand, you will realize more than enough money to pay these additional expenses. I want to say, that if we were right in 1908 in fixing these salaries, as we did then, we are dead wrong now in not increasing them at least 33 1/3 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman must realize that in the sale of the products to which he referred there would be only one saving. The gentleman proposes to continue the cost here?

Mr. CRAGO. No. None of these provisions provide for the continuance here of this rate or this scale of pay for more than one year from June 30, 1920. And if at that time it is considered by Congress that the cost of living has been reduced, and salaries are being greatly reduced in other lines of industry, I would be in favor of reducing it, because when we fixed it in 1908 we based it on the standards existing then.

Mr. BEE. As I understand it, there is nothing in this bill that provides for the increase of pay of officers?

Mr. CRAGO. No.

Mr. BEE. Has the gentleman any information as to when the Army pay bill, by which the increase will be made, will be reported?

Mr. CRAGO. I have not. I am simply answering some of the statements made on the floor of this House. As to the bill itself, I think very well of many of the salient features of this bill and of the principles underlying it. I also think very well of many of the provisions of the Senate bill, and in considering this bill many of us are constrained to favor it because we realize that in a conference between the two Houses many of the good features of the Senate bill may be incorporated in this bill, and that out of this conference of the two Houses may come a reorganization of our Military Establishment which will redound to great good to our Military Establishment and to the people of this country. In considering this bill one of the difficult things before the committee has been the fact that each branch of the service wanted special consideration. Each particular officer thought that his situation must be considered, and it has been a fight all along the line to let these different branches know that what we were after was the formation of an army which could properly function, more than we were interested in the fortunes, good or bad, of any particular branch of the Army or of any particular man in the service. That is the only way we can look at it, and that is the only way we can accomplish anything, at the same time doing what we think and know is right and best for the great majority of the men who have given their lives to this very important work.

Now, without going into the details of the many meritorious features of the bill we have framed as to the Army, I want to discuss just for a short time the provisions relating to the National Guard.

I do this because of the fact that I have had so much correspondence with men of the National Guard who have been fearful that Congress at this time would not give them a proper reorganization plan. These officers themselves differ widely as to what plan is best. The National Guard officers may be divided into two schools: Those who follow the views of the adjutants general of the different States and those who follow the views of men of the line or the staff who have branched out and given the subject of military science and military training that intense study, by reason of courses at the Army schools, which has enabled them to have a broader grasp of the National Guard problem than the mere matter of administration, which is centered in the office of The Adjutant General. In answer to many of these communications I have said that, in my opinion, Congress to-day is in absolute sympathy with the National Guard of the United States, and Congress wants to do whatever is best for this National Guard.

Now, these two schools of thought divide on the question of whether we form our National Guard under the militia clause of the Constitution or whether we do something we have never done before, except in emergencies, and organize this voluntary force under the Army clause of the Constitution. If we do the latter, this is what we can accomplish: We can put the organization, the equipment, and the training of the National Guard exclusively under Federal control, and we will still have the dual use of the National Guard; a dual use, either under certain conditions by the Federal Government or under other conditions by the State governments, and we will not confuse the organization, the equipment, and the training with the use of the National Guard of the different States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Does this bill put the National Guard under the exclusive control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government?

Mr. CRAGO. No; it is still under dual control. This bill leaves it under the militia clause of the Constitution. Now, the National Guard of the States in the past war performed a wonderful service. But here are some things that happened to it, about which they are very sore, and rightfully so, to-day: Many men who may not have been fitted for active field service, but who had given years of their time and money and study and best talent to the maintenance of the National Guard, were absolutely thrown out of their organizations which they took into these concentration camps; and many men of brains, business men and professional men, who would have made splendid officers in some other arm of the service, were sent back to their homes and never recognized, while other men from their very homes were taken from the same line of business or the same profession to which these men belonged and sent into active service and sent to France, although they had no military training whatever; and these men who had given their lives to this work were absolutely ignored.

When the Government took the National Guard units into the service they weeded them out properly, but the Overman Act allowed them to ignore the provisions of the national defense act, which provided for the recruitment in each locality of a battalion for each regiment of the National Guard taken into the service of the United States. That provision was put into the national defense act looking to the very situation which occurred, namely, that you took these regiments from a certain locality. In that same locality you kept constantly organized a reserve battalion from which recruitments could be made.

Some people say that the draft act upset that. The draft act did not do anything of the kind. Under the draft act the men drafted could have been put into these battalions that were kept back for training and recruitment purposes and the ranks of the regiments at the front filled from these very localities.

What happened was this: They sent some of the recruits for these National Guard organizations right to the front line with but a few weeks' training, while in the camps of this country men taken from the very same localities where these National Guard organizations originated, who had been training for six or eight or nine months were left; but because it did not suit a certain commander to send these trained men, other men, say, for example, men from New Mexico, were taken, without experience or training, and put into a New York or a Pennsylvania organization; and you have these organizations coming back to their localities, not knowing from what State many of the men came who formed a part of those organizations.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Does the gentleman mean with reference to the national organizations to which they belonged?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes. These divisions came back to their own States and are mustered out, and they find out that they had in their ranks men from every State in the Union.

Mr. BEE. Not from their own localities?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes; and they did not have the addresses or the history of these men. They are searching the records to-day to find out where their own men belonged.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Did the gentleman hear the statement that was made before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by Col. Donovan about replacement troops that were sent to his regiment while they were at the front? He spoke of the condition that the gentleman has just referred to.

The officers in charge of troops that were in training did not send the well-trained troops to the front for replacement, because they wanted those troops themselves, when their organization should go to the front, and instead they sent men who had not been trained more than two or three weeks.

Mr. CRAGO. That is exactly true, and that is exactly the criticism I am making now; and that could not have occurred if they had adhered to the provisions of the national defense act and had retained this recruitment battalion back home.

Mr. KAHN. And it would not have occurred if we had had universal training before we got into the war?

Mr. CRAGO. It could not have occurred.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman think it ought to have been made up of troops from their States?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes. The national defense act provided for that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman allow me to make a short statement that was made to me by the Hon. J. Fred. Talbott, of our State, a short time before his death?

Mr. CRAGO. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. He said that during the Civil War one regiment from Maryland was entirely wiped out, and it played

such havoc through the State that the War Department wanted to avoid that very thing and not have all the men from one locality.

Mr. CRAGO. That is one argument, but that very seldom happens.

What happened in Maryland in that regiment could not happen here because some of the men we got did not have the same customs, did not have the same thoughts, did not have the same ways as these boys that went to the front. Here is a concrete example. I could not believe that men were over there on the battle front who had only served three or four weeks. I said that could not happen under our system because the men are trained here four to six months. They said it was true; they knew it. But I found they had men there sent from New Mexico who had not been in camp 10 days before they were sent to the front with an organization as quickly as they could get there, and that they had no training whatever; yet out at Camp Sherman were thousands of men from that immediate vicinity who were thoroughly trained, but they would not let them go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That statement was made to me by Mr. Talbott who served during the Civil War.

Mr. CRAGO. Oh, yes; that might occur, but it would occur more readily in a small organization than in a large organization.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the gentleman think that officers who put men in the front ranks, men who had not been trained, ought to be court-martialed?

Mr. CRAGO. The difficulty is that you can not fix the responsibility very well. Under their system they called for so many men to be sent from certain cantonments, and it would be simply impossible to put your finger on the exact man responsible for the personnel sent.

Mr. HARRISON. The fault was not in not training the men, but the fault was of the officer who put men not trained in the front ranks.

Mr. CRAGO. The fault was in not having trained all our young men before, so that in the event of war we could have all trained men. [Applause.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Would this bill obviate the difficulty that arose in my own district? They wanted a unit to remain and be retained as a unit, and the matter was taken up with The Adjutant General. He telegraphed back that conditions were such that the effectiveness of the Army could not be secured by maintaining the local unit, and therefore the unit was disorganized and scattered. Is it possible to have an effective Army and maintain the local unit?

Mr. CRAGO. It is possible, no question about that, and under the national defense act and this act it is possible; without the interference made possible by the Overman Act they could not have disrupted this organization.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I will.

Mr. KAHN. My colleague does not believe that such an organization could be kept intact all through the war?

Mr. CRAGO. I think the gentleman refers to something like this, say, "Company K, Fifth Regiment," from his State. They could keep its identity all through the war, but, of course, the men might all be changed.

Mr. KAHN. It would not be possible to maintain men in the company from that particular locality all through the war.

Mr. CRAGO. Yes; if you followed the provisions of the national defense act and kept always in existence the training battalion.

Mr. KAHN. Does it not depend altogether on the casualties?

Mr. CRAGO. On the casualties and the size of the Army.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. While that is true, is there anything in military science that is opposed to taking a unit—Company K of a certain regiment or the regiment itself of infantry or a battery—and using it, at least in the beginning, together rather than scattering it?

Mr. CRAGO. That is what should be done, for that is what keeps up the local pride, carries out the traditions, and makes the strength of the Army.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I will.

Mr. SANFORD. Following the gentleman's suggestion, would it not be necessary, under the policy of this bill, if we got into

a war where we did not have allies—would it not be necessary to use untrained men in the front lines?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes; if we had no men trained; if we neglect the opportunity of training all our young men. But now let me get at what the bill does for the National Guard. They are trying to reorganize the National Guard in different States, and they are up against some real propositions.

Now, what they are up against in reorganizing the National Guard to-day is the fact that at the end of a man's Federal service he thereby severs his connection with the National Guard, even though only half of his term of enlistment had expired. They must completely reorganize these companies. They have ruled also that organizations of the National Guard, in order to be acceptable, must consist of 100 men to each company, because they say the tables of organization for the Regular Establishment prescribe 100 men, not taking into consideration the fact that many of these companies have only from 50 to 75, 80, or 90 men in them. They require the National Guard organization to have 100 men from the beginning. Now, what happens? Our armories in the States, where they have spent on the company armories from \$50,000 to \$100,000 and on the regimental armories hundreds of thousands of dollars, are based on 65 men to a company. In this bill we have made the minimum for the first year 50 men for reorganization purposes, and the bureau must recognize the company when it is so reorganized. After the first year 65 men will be the minimum. I do not object seriously if it is necessary later on under the new tables of organization to increase that number. We may be able to do it later, but let us get the National Guard reorganized first.

Now, prior to entry into the Federal service this was the way the pay of the National Guard was working: If a high enough percentage of the men did not show up for drill, the captain and the lieutenants got their pay, but the enlisted men did not get any pay, because enough of their comrades did not show up. This bill reverses that and puts it up to the captain and his officers to have the men there. If the attendance of men falls below a certain mark, the officers do not get their pay but the men who show up for drill, whether 5, 10, 15, or 20 of them, get their pay, and their pay is provided for under this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. This refers to the National Guard?

Mr. CRAGO. Absolutely.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the requirement for the minimum number of men in a company in the regular service?

Mr. CRAGO. The tables of organization provide for 100 men.

Mr. MADDEN. But now they have companies with not more than 15 or 25. I know of majors who are commanding battalions of less than 100 men.

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And regiments of not more than 300 men, with 3 colonels and 3 lieutenant colonels and 4 majors and 5 or 6 captains. What is the remedy for that?

Mr. CRAGO. That is hardly a matter for legislation. It is really a matter of proper administration of the armed forces of our country.

Mr. MADDEN. Why should there be so many officers when there are so few men?

Mr. CRAGO. I do not think we have enough officers, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. BEE. Following the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois, is it not a fact that the difficulty is not because they have too many officers, but because there has been a tendency in this country to decry joining the United States Army, until they have discouraged young men from joining?

Mr. CRAGO. Oh, yes.

Mr. BEE. Can you disorganize your entire system of military training in order to have the proper proportionate complement of officers?

Mr. CRAGO. No; it is more important to have a proper complement of officers in time of peace than it is to have the necessary complement of men.

Mr. BEE. Even if you do not have the men for them to drill?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Who has been decrying joining the military service? I do not know of anybody.

Mr. CRAGO. I do not think the gentleman has.

Mr. BEE. I do not mean the gentleman from Illinois, unless he takes it to himself.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Under the conditions described, though, would it not be better to put the enlisted men in command and take care of the officers in that way?

Mr. CRAGO. I hardly think that would necessarily follow. The national defense of this country, in my opinion, can not rest entirely on our Regular Army. I am a believer in every citizen of our country doing his part toward the national defense, in



our Army or Navy or Marine Corps, just as we do our part when we pay our taxes. Every man is subject to taxation according to his ability. In times of emergency, in times of great need of the Government, some men more able to do so or more disposed to do so may volunteer to do far beyond what is absolutely required of them in financing the Government, but there is a basis on which all must stand, and I think that is true in the defense of our country. The ideal system, to my mind, is a citizen army thoroughly trained, under the control as to its training, equipment, and organization of the Federal Government, subject to the use either of the Federal Government or of the State government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAGO. We never can get the kind of citizen army, in my opinion, which we really need under a strictly volunteer system. I believe that any system of universal training which may be adopted—call it what you may—should have a provision in it that any young man who cared to serve his country in a National Guard organization rather than take his training under the Federal instructors would have his option of doing so. If you will give these National Guard officers, who by that time will have had this training at the service schools and are competent to impart instruction, the material with which to work, they will build up organizations which will be effective. I can see no reason why in any system of military instruction which we give the youth of our land we can not have that instruction in the hands of men who have made this profession their life work and still keep it democratic and free from any taint of militarism. In fact, just the opposite, we can base it on the same principles as our collegiate, academic education of the youth of our land is based.

The boys are sent to these institutions, and in this other training they will be sent to camps to be there under the direct control, guidance, and tutelage of instructors, who have made this training their life work; these college professors do not dictate the policy or command these boys absolutely, or deprive them of their rights, or give them this, or take from them that, because the civilian, not the educator, sits on the board of trustees of the institution and directs the policy of the institution, and any system of training which we adopt in this country could be managed on that basis by which a civilian board would operate through the men who have made military science their life work, who have made a life study of this profession, men who have made the laws of our country a study, men who are adapted to teaching discipline and respect for our institutions, and they would be the instruments by which this civilian board would conduct this instruction. When we have built up this civilian army as we can build it up, with the Regular Army as our institution of learning, giving this instruction, we will then have started on a course which will develop for this Nation of ours a force which can defy any army on the face of the earth, because the education of that Army will be in the proper spirit; and until we do that then in any great emergency we will surely be subject to the same criticism as we have had growing out of this war, where men who have given their life to this work have not been accorded the credit which rightfully belongs to them; where men have come back from the greatest service they have ever performed in their lives, utterly disgusted, complaining of the treatment they have received, when as a matter of fact they should have come back conscious of the fact that they have done everything which a citizen of a free country can be asked to do in behalf of his country. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill has some good provisions, but I am opposed to it as it is written. The Air Service is neglected; the dangerous policy of lump-sum appropriations is established; the General Staff is given too much authority, made too large, and too many of its members are to sit in Washington. Too many Army officers sit here now in swivel chairs whose main business is to "pass the buck." The bill provides for too many officers of high rank. Many of its provisions mean waste of money, which is indefensible. I wish to discuss in detail but one provision of the bill.

The construction division should be made separate and permanent. If not made separate, it should be a part of the Engineer Corps, with which it is closely connected.

Instead of consolidating commercial construction work for the Army and the operation of utilities at the different War Department properties under one head, this bill makes necessary six small construction divisions to do that character of work for the

different bureaus of the War Department. No more uneconomic disposition could be made of this subject. The necessity of placing this construction work and operation of utilities under a single bureau or service of the War Department is apparent. It is evident that it should not be under a bureau that has other specialties.

This bill provides that only construction, maintenance, and repair and operation of utilities connected with the housing of officers and enlisted men and the storage and issue of quartermaster supplies shall be done by the Quartermaster Corps. It does not attempt to set up a single organization to handle the large and important work of construction, which the experience of the recent war has shown to be vitally necessary to efficiency and economy. The bill scatters the construction organization among all the various bureaus of the War Department which have such work to do, at least six in number, such as the Ordnance Department, the Aviation Corps, the Chemical Warfare Service, the Medical Corps, the Signal Corps, and the Quartermaster Corps. Each will set up its own small construction division and each maintain its own central office overhead, with the consequent expense and waste of public funds.

It is needless to argue that one central office overhead will be a great saving over six separate central office overheads for the various bureaus. A single construction service would enable the War Department to have the advantage of specialists in the various lines of construction and repair work and the maintenance and operation of utilities, whose talent could be devoted alike to the needs of the entire service for all bureaus.

If economy is to be the watchword of this Congress, it will certainly shoot wide the mark in destroying a splendid organization whose worth has been abundantly proved during the recent emergency and scattering the services rendered by that organization among six different bureaus, which must each set up its own construction division as a side issue to its other important duties. The bill proposes to set up the department of finance, which before the war belonged to the Quartermaster Corps, the Chemical Warfare Service, which before the war belonged to the Ordnance Department, because it was realized that these were matters to be handled by specialists; but when it came to the work of the construction division, which is highly technical, requiring trained specialists, and which is known to have been eminently successful and efficient during the war, it is proposed to scatter it among the various bureaus upon the ground of economy. If this silly thing should be done, it will result in inefficiency and indefensible extravagance.

The work done by the predecessor of the construction division during the 10 years prior to the war averaged in volume one-tenth of the entire appropriations for the Army. This same work will in the future certainly not be less than one-tenth of the amount of the appropriations for the Army, whatever they may be and whatever the size of the Army may be. In this very bill the Army proposed to be created will require an expenditure for construction of not less than \$48,000,000 per annum. Surely sane business judgment requires the setting up of one service to handle this large expenditure which shall specialize upon the same and be organized entirely for this work, rather than to allow it to be placed in various bureaus, where it must of necessity play second fiddle to some purely technical military operation.

It is a well-known fact that the construction division of the Army during the late war at all times maintained its prestige, accomplished all of its tasks assigned on time in a creditable manner. It is clear that the credit of assembling the American Expeditionary Forces in France six months ahead of schedule was due to the speed maintained by the construction division in providing the necessary housing and training facilities on time in 1917. This division has never been investigated, has never been the target of adverse criticism, has overcome apparently insurmountable difficulties with ease and dispatch, and accomplished a task in 18 months that makes the construction of the Panama Canal look very insignificant in the light of the records established by this branch of the service.

The reorganization of the services of the construction division by providing for a permanent construction organization will meet with the unqualified approval of all the engineering societies of this country and all engineers who played such an important part in the construction program of the Army after its organization in April, 1917.

Too much credit can not be given the construction corps, and I am confident that every Member of this House who carefully studies the record of facts will cordially support an amendment to be proposed at the proper time making this division permanent. You, I believe, will support it in the interest of the tax-



payer, in the interest of good business, in the interest of efficient government, and in the interest of effective and expeditious service to our country, both in time of peace and in time of war. The brilliant record of the construction division of the Army is irrefutable and convincing. This corps is the one capable, energetic, progressive, and efficient division of the Army that does the job on time and does it well. It should be made separate and permanent. The Army can not be efficiently organized without this provision. I appeal to the Members of the House to adopt the amendment making such provision. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY].

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a funeral oration over universal military training, because I consider this subject far from dead, and it is my desire to keep it alive.

When the Military Academy bill was before the House about two weeks ago I took occasion to address the Members on the subject of universal military training. Since that day, February 17, the Military Affairs Committee voted by a substantial majority indefinite postponement of such legislation.

Said action was disappointing, for in my opinion a system of universal military training is the best insurance the Federal Government can adopt against the possibilities of war, besides upbuilding and improving the health, morale, and mentality of the youth of America.

In my speech of February 17 I also advocated a progressive decrease of the Regular Army as feasible, wise, and consistent. This bill makes provisions for an army of practically 300,000 men and 18,000 officers.

Hand and hand with universal military training should go a small Regular Army and a great economical saving would ensue.

In my opinion it would be a fatal error to reduce our officer strength, for if we have learned any lessons from the World War we now must appreciate the great demand for officer material in an emergency.

As I pointed out in the House two weeks ago, the average cost of the soldier to-day is \$1,750 per year, including overhead charges, as against \$1,000 per year per man five years ago.

If we provide a progressive decrease of the Army from 300,000 to 150,000, taking \$1,500 per year per man as a basis, since we do not provide for a decrease in officers, we could save 150,000 multiplied by \$1,500, or \$225,000,000, and my figures furnished the Members of the House February 17 from the head of the finance division of the War Department showed indisputably and incontrovertibly that the incorporation of universal military training into our Military Establishment in the fourth year of its induction, after the machinery had been organized and was in active operation, would cost the Government less than \$135,000,000. Therefore, having a small Regular Army combined with the citizen-soldier proposition, the United States could save about a hundred million dollars a year over the present policy as outlined in the Army reorganization bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLNEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. The gentleman has given us the benefit of his information in respect to the Army as proposed by him. Can he give us the figures, the amount of money it would cost to maintain the Army under this bill?

Mr. OLNEY. I have incorporated all these figures by tables as furnished me by the head of the finance division, and it is in the RECORD of February 17, 1920, in very comprehensive form.

In lieu of writing a section in this bill providing for universal military training the committee voted to appoint a committee to study the question and report its findings to the whole committee at a subsequent date to suit its convenience.

Five years ago in this Chamber we listened to speeches both for and against preparedness. A conspicuous and able Member of Congress in 1915 was the late Maj. Augustus P. Gardner, and well do we recall his sounding the alarm to a Nation unprepared and unpreparing for war. He was ever preaching for a larger Navy and a bigger and more efficient Army, and he was right, and while his exhortations fell on deaf ears, he was largely responsible for our efficient Navy when we entered the war. Five years ago, while Gardner and KAHN were trying to enlighten Congress as to the imperative needs of the Army and Navy and to goad it into action, other Members now in this Congress, contemptuous of their warnings and arguments, smiled placidly, relied upon blessed security, and openly stated in debate that the United States could never become embroiled in the Great War. We did get into that war, at great cost to man and woman kind and to the Public Treasury, and I venture to say if we had been ready we would have emerged from the war with half the life and money spent which it cost us in the end.

For this very reason I am in favor of a policy which will train half a million young Americans a year. You would be considered careless and neglectful indeed if you failed to insure your dwelling house against loss by fire. Therefore, why should you fail to insure your country against destruction through war. Universal military training is the best insurance you can take out for Uncle Sam, and we shall never consider our labors at an end in Congress until we write such a provision into military law, and then, and only then, will we have provided for our Republic one great democratic army, fed, nourished, and propagated by one great reservoir, the 48 States of the Union, a national asset and a national necessity.

Although an ardent advocate of universal military training, I am not blind to the pending appropriations, which are enormous, urgent, and absolutely necessary, and therefore postponement of such remedial legislation is feasible but should become effective July 1, 1922, although such provision should be written into law at our earliest convenience.

Doubtless the teeth of Germany are drawn for the present, and crippled as she is, with her former allies, she offers no immediate menace to civilization, but, gradually renewing her commercial prestige, she is also maintaining and supporting an army of four to five hundred thousand men, and, with an adequate navy in the future, her ugly head will rise again some day to challenge and threaten the world peace, and we must not be caught again unawares asleep over a volcano.

In conclusion, it seems to be the opinion of the friends of universal training that a test vote in this House would result in its defeat of 3 to 1, and it perhaps is the better part of wisdom to have the policy studied and investigated and a report on the findings submitted to the Members at some future convenient date rather than to have a knock-out blow delivered at once to so important and necessary an adjunct to the national defense.

As far as I personally am concerned, I am as strong in the faith as when advocating the idea five years ago, can never change my spots, and will always be found on the firing line loaded, primed, and ready to offer battle for universal military training.

Mr. Chairman, in the remainder of my time I desire to say but one or two words. At this time, however, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a letter written by one McGuinness, of New York, to the New York Sunday Tribune, in which he proposes a substitute for a bonus bill. It is a relief proposition, and I believe if the Members of the House are to face any proposition to relieve the ex-service men of exigencies and urgencies in time of need, and we may have to face it, this proposition submitted by this ex-service man furnishes valuable information. It would cost the Government about a quarter of a billion dollars, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

RELIEF BUT NOT BONUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE:

SIR: The question of a bonus to ex-service men seems to be pre-eminently in the minds of Congress and the country in general. I think you will agree with me that the bonus is desired, not as a reward for fulfilling one of the duties of citizenship, but as an aid to those men financially embarrassed as a result thereof. It seems to me that the income-tax law offers a medium through which some relief may be granted, approximating in direct proportion to the need.

Roughly, my plan is as follows:

1. Grant total exemption to married men earning less than \$3,000 and single men earning less than \$2,000.
2. Married men earning over \$3,000 and single men earning over \$2,000 would be granted no additional exemption, but would have to pay taxes on all income above \$2,000 and \$1,000, respectively, as at present.

3. Married men earning less than \$2,000 and single men earning less than \$1,000 should be given a cash bonus of \$50 annually.
4. Cripples, etc., to be especially provided for.

This plan could be put in vogue for a period of five years, or on a graduated basis of one year for each six months of service.

The merits of this plan are as follows:

1. The total cost to the Government would be within a quarter of a billion dollars, spread over a five-year period. This would cause no currency inflation.

2. The exemptions and the bonuses would be given only to the needy.
3. No examining board would be necessary to judge the applicant's claim. The income-tax blank would be the examining board.

4. The service man, having paid his taxes "over there," would not be as reluctant in accepting tax exemption as he would be in accepting so-called "blood money."

As an ex-service man and a member of the American Legion, I am opposed to any bonus plan which would inflate our currency, boost the cost of living, and eventually divide the bonus among the profiteers.

WILLIAM V. MCGUINNESS.

NEW YORK, March 3, 1920.

Mr. OLNEY. Before closing my remarks, I wish to urge upon the steering committee on the Republican side of the House and



the leaders on the Democratic side of the House the imperative necessity of passing the pay bill, increasing the pay of the officers in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, pending to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken or who may speak on this bill may be allowed to extend and revise their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all those who speak on this bill or who have spoken on the bill have unanimous consent to extent their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that even that general consent can be given in Committee of the Whole. In the Committee of the Whole consent can be given to one individual, but not a blanket consent.

Mr. KAHN. Then I shall renew the request in the House and withdraw it at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 25 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a good bill and I shall, taking it as a whole, support it. It will afford the best legal basis that the Army has had for many years. In its general scope the legislation works over the national defense act of June 3, 1916, and brings that act down to date, adjusting it to peace-time conditions. The present act builds on a broad and permanent basis. It is no small task to work out a comprehensive plan for the present and future and to so frame the law that we shall preserve the benefit of our experiences in the Great War.

It was inevitable that in the sudden expansion of our military force to 4,000,000 men we should have indulged in much that was experimental, though in this respect we perhaps did much less than our associates.

Some of our departmental bureaus and branches were incapable of the necessary expansion to meet the emergencies of war. Their bases would not admit of it. In such case a complete organization had to be worked out and built from the ground up. Branches and elements of the service, for which no basis existed, also had to be worked out.

The task now is to reduce and in doing so to preserve the skeleton of such of these as experience has demonstrated to be practical and useful and to so provide that these branches may be expanded at once to meet the requirements of any emergency.

As to how this may be done, of course, men will differ not only fundamentally but in detail.

The committee has had these various plans and details outlined where difficulties exist and has undertaken to work out and lay down the ground plans which most strongly appeal to it as practical for the present and future.

#### THE SIZE OF THE ARMY.

Section 2 of the bill states the number in the Regular Establishment. The bill sets out what are to be known as the combatant arms or the line of the Army. Except in time of war, or when the public necessity demands it, the number of enlisted men shall not exceed 250,000; Philippine Scouts, 12,000; and 7,000 unassigned recruits. At no time shall the establishment, excluding the Philippine Scouts, exceed 280,000 enlisted men. The number of officers is 15,037, exclusive of the officers in the medical department, chaplains, band leaders, and professors, all as provided for in the bill.

It will be immediately appreciated that this is no small establishment. While it is about 100,000 in excess of the number provided for in the national defense act of June 3, 1916, it is but one-half—exactly one-half—the number asked for by the War Department.

The great question is, Can this force be further cut—can a further reduction be made? Some of our very best military minds place the number provided for in the bill as inadequate. The greater number, however, have expressed themselves that the number when properly and efficiently disposed of will meet all requirements so far as can now be determined. The disposition of the committee was to reduce to the lowest possible number, consistent with the safety of the country—to cut to the bone. I know there are some who will think this number too great. There are some who believe in practically no Army, at least, not an effective one.

To those who are opposed to an effective Army, I have neither the time, the disposition, nor the patience to discuss the question. In general, I fear they are those, or the successors of those, who influenced Members of the Sixty-fourth and the preceding Congresses to oppose every effort to enter upon any preparedness program commensurate with the dangers menacing

the world. Blinded by prejudice, or mistaken in judgment, or by whatever course of reasoning or by whatever influence they came to their state of minds, theirs was the colossal mistake of the century. I can honor every man for his personal views if they be founded upon candid, mature reflection and faithful research—a candid, fair-minded disposition to ascertain the requirements of Government.

But the man, pig-headed and prejudiced, immune to reason, fixed and unyielding in his own ignorance of the subject matter, one who sits in bigoted intolerance of others on matters of such profound concern to the people and to the Nation, is a man to whom no Member of this House should for one moment give an attentive ear. The sooner such a man and his argument are dismissed the better. No one wants such evil counsel.

I, for one, by the help of God and the act of a free, enlightened, and intelligent people, never want this Nation in the helpless military condition it was in on the day we passed the declaration of war, April 6, 1917. [Applause.]

As direct consequence of our national failure to do anything in the way of preparing to fight the fire, which was spreading throughout the world, we waited in childlike tranquillity until the blaze was at the door.

I, for one, shall never fail in my efforts to avert a repetition of this sad, if not tragic failure. Three epochs of history are calling us to profit by our past experiences—the periods following the close of the Mexican, the Civil, and the Spanish Wars.

It is not economy to save to-day for the purpose of having a surplus to waste to-morrow. [Applause.]

National security, the welfare of our people, the stability of our institutions, our capacity to remain immune to the evil things which are sweeping over the world to-day require that we organize and maintain an adequate and instantly effective Military and Naval Establishment. [Applause.]

#### GENERAL STAFF CORPS.

The bill provides for an effective General Staff Corps. I am a firm believer in a strong, effective, vigorous General Staff. Without it no army, however well organized and equipped, can effectively operate. The staff is the planning section of the Army, as well as the coordinating. To give it administrative authority only as a "last-ditch" expedient would tend to throw every other administrative branch to the wind. Our experience in the late war has demonstrated beyond all possible doubt the advantages of the staff principle. When we look about to locate the force, the organization that brought about the expansion of our establishment to meet the emergency of war, the eye, as well as the hand, rests upon the General Staff Corps. It must be retained to have an effective Army.

#### ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Provision is made for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of War, who shall be under the Secretary and shall be charged with the supervision of the procurement of all military supplies, and other business of the War Department relating thereto. This is an idea upon which there was practical unanimity.

It is the hope that in the future an experienced and capable business man will be selected for this position, and that he will not be what is regarded as a political appointment. The welfare of the service requires that there should be an element of permanency in this position. No position in connection with the entire Military Establishment is of more importance than this.

Everything relating to the supply service comes within his jurisdiction. He is the personal director or head of the business end of the Army. One of his principal duties is to keep in touch with the supply resources of the country.

Another very important provision of the bill is the finance service. This is also a creation growing out of our experiences in the late war. It shall be the duty of the chief of finance, under the authority of the Secretary of War, to make disbursement of all funds of the War Department, including the pay of the Army and the mileage of officers and the accounting therefor. The position of paymaster attached to the Quartermaster Corps is superseded by the representative of this newly created branch, though provision is made, in the interest of economy of administration, that officers outside this department may perform these duties where small units are being dealt with. This is to avoid duplication of overhead expenses.

The Quartermaster Corps, under the Secretary of War, is charged with the purchase of all standard supplies common to two or more branches of the service, and with the construction, maintenance, and repair of buildings, structures, and utilities of the Army establishment. This corps has charge of storage, transportation, the acquisition of real estate, and other similar services.



It will be noted that the Construction Corps, the Transportation Service, and the Motor Transport Corps are eliminated.

My own personal judgment is that we have made a mistake in doing away with some of these, especially the Construction Corps. Could I have had my way I should most surely have preserved this construction branch of the Army. I can see no sufficient reason for its rejection from this act. There is no inherent relation between it and the Quartermaster Corps. In my opinion we have dropped backward. The construction branch as an element of the Quartermaster Corps is out of date, obsolete, and not in tune with the modern situation of things. If we were building a Military Establishment from the beginning, if we had never had one, and especially if construction, repair, and maintenance had never been within the Quartermaster Corps, there would have been no thought of placing it there now. It bears no inherent relation, no connection, no association, kinship, or fitness to the quartermaster. Every function is foreign. The fundamental duty of a quartermaster is to receive and distribute supplies to the Army. It should be primarily the function of the Quartermaster Corps to serve as the distributing factor of the service.

In event it should be made necessary to destroy this very efficient and valuable, I might say indispensable, service to have it absorbed, swallowed up in some other branch, my thought is that it should go into the Engineers Corps. There is something of a remote kinship between engineering and construction, but there is none, absolutely none, where this bill puts it.

Then again, "storage." What business, what necessity is there; what sense is there in placing the storage of everything in the Quartermaster Corps? In the very nature of things the storage of much of the material used in the Army should be with the branch of the service which produces or supplies that material or necessity. To illustrate, I can see no possible reason for the Quartermaster Corps having charge of the storage of arms and artillery ammunition, and so forth. That should be with the Ordnance branch of the service. The same with medical supplies, which should be in the Medical Department.

In my humble opinion we have crowded into the Quartermaster Corps duties, privileges, and functions wholly alien and extraneous. We have not only crowded it but overwhelmed it, and that too with a diversity of service wholly incompatible with the good of the Army.

The construction corps should be an independent corps functioning as such, with its own organization, its own personnel, and its own character. It should be a corps of builders. Building nowadays is a business—a remarkably technical one. It is not a mere passing trade or occupation—not in these days—and if we are disposed to apply any of the rules of business to the Army organization we should retain that remarkably efficient organization, wrought out of our war experiences, known as the Construction Corps.

The Judge Advocate General's Department is only simplified in personnel. The elaborate organization, existing during the war, is brought down to a peace-time basis.

My judgement is that some new plan or system of administering military justice should be devised, but this would necessitate the adoption of a new military code—the magnitude and detail of which would manifestly render it impossible for this bill to contain, dealing as it does merely with the outline of the Army reorganization.

I hope soon to see the day when this entire system will be relegated to the waste pile, where it rightfully belongs. It is outgrown; it is obsolete; it is vicious. Human experience and the advance of the human understanding cry out for a change. The present system of administering justice, the methods, principles, and procedure dealing with the violators of military laws and regulations are, so far as I know, the only surviving tag-end of the Dark Ages. It is not only crude, but positively cruel, and in many cases barbarous. It is the last remaining remnant of the power of an autocracy or class, which once upon a time governed and controlled everything relating to the Military Establishment as a part of organized governments. We have outgrown the system. The world has gone on and taken everything else with it except this ancient institution, which long ere this should have eliminated from among our living methods of dealing with men. It is open to the assault of every human and modern sentiment. It is not to be wondered at that the young man of to-day, brought up as he is amid our institutions, so framed as to guard with care every right, will not freely and voluntarily offer himself into a life where this miserable system is the basis of his Government and this procedure the method of administration.

But to accomplish this our whole military code must be revised, if not completely rewritten, upon a new and modern basis. To do this would take a bill three times the length of this. Let me again say that this bill just furnishes the outline of the

Army reorganization, not the forms, procedures, rules, and the myriad of details.

I am heartily in sympathy with every effort to bring about this much-needed reform. [Applause.]

The idea that the forms, procedures, and methods of two centuries ago can not be improved upon, as seems to be entertained by some, must be addressed, if at all, to the blind reactionaries, not to the living, advancing thought of the people of to-day. My suggestion is that it be not embodied in this bill wherein at best only a fragment of any modern system can be embraced and where such as there be would be jeopardized, if not positively annulled, by some obliging construction of a half-expressed plan. [Applause.]

There is a novel piece of legislation in the bill, commonly known as the "single list," for promotions. The method and manner of promotion has been the bone of contention in the Army many, many years. At some periods the methods now in force have come dangerously near affecting the morale. It seems now that the best thought in the Army is the single list, by which promotions will come equally to all branches or arms of the service. The overwhelming demand for the establishment of this equitable method at this time speaks in most commendable language of the absence of narrow selfishness amongst the officers of the Army. Many will lose files, if not grades, by the establishment of the system, but nevertheless it meets with almost universal approval.

The permanent commissioning of officers in certain branches of the noncombatant branches of the service is another piece of wise and salutary legislation.

Provision is made to continue the Chemical Warfare Service as an independent branch of the service, similar to the Ordnance and Engineer Corps. This is another wise arrangement, embodying as it does the best experiences of the war.

Nurses are given rank, but chaplains are not. This is another incongruity of this bill. I am content with the provision affecting nurses. It is well worthy of a trial. I know it is an innovation, and in the end it may prove unsatisfactory. The criticism, if any, must be addressed to the novelty of this legislation. The plan outlined here may not withstand the hard school of practical test in the service; if so, subsequent legislation can cure the error. The success of this provision will largely depend upon the course and conduct of the benefited members of this branch. In its permanent attachment as a unit to the service it will in the last analysis have to stand or fall upon the success or failure of its personnel in the new situation. I hope it will not be a misfit.

As to the chaplains, I can not agree with my distinguished colleague on the committee that they should have no rank. We can all philosophize, we can discuss, reflect, ruminate, if you please, regretfully or otherwise, but, after all, we must come to the conclusion by acknowledging that rank does count in the Army. True it is that the post of chaplain has no counterpart or similitude in the service. His position is distinct, it is individual as a class, it is personal. The chaplain's power for good lies in his personality. He is the sole exemplar of peace, mercy, and good will amongst men in an institution founded and maintained for enforcing law and rule by force and often by violence. But his function is not so paradoxical as it may seem. He is a wonderful power for good. The pages of history are brightened by the records of his noble acts. The roll of honor in the late war contains the names of too many self-sacrificing patriots, who bore the cross upon their shoulders instead of the bar, the leaf, the eagle, or the star, not to do all respect and reverence to the bearer. The chaplains have had Army rank for years—ever since we have had an Army—and it should not come to us now in the face of their wonderful service in the late war to deny them what I believe is their due.

The provisions of the bill relating to the National Guard, I believe, will be found fairly, if not entirely, satisfactory to the guard. It is by far the best law, so far as putting the guard forward to where it belongs, of any act ever presented to Congress. In incorporating these excellent features the committee simply is reflecting the unanimous opinion of the officers of the Regular Army in their estimation of the National Guard as a national military asset. Unstinted praise came from every source, and for the first time in many years the guard is weighed and appreciated at its true worth. [Applause.] The committee, therefore, was of the opinion that now was the opportune time to place the present and the future of the guard in the hands of its friends—something never done before—by providing that the Chief of the Militia Bureau shall be appointed from among the officers of that body who have served in the guard as a commissioned officer at least 10 years.

Seemingly I have criticized this bill as much as I have commended it, but criticisms demand enumeration. That which meets the approval, like the many thing which are good, gen-



erally passes without special mention. So it is with this bill. The many, very many good features so far outstrip the weak, the bad ones, that I even hesitate to critically scan the handiwork of the committee in which I performed so humble a part. There are other provisions I should very much like to discuss, but I must desist lest I trespass further upon the time of my colleagues.

Of my colleagues in this very important committee—few, if any, there are in the House that surpass it—I can say their sole motive in formulating the bill, with all its varied and in some respect novel features, is, and at all times was, the welfare and the good of the service. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I can not vote for this bill, but I admit that there are some very good provisions in it. In my judgment, for a peace-time Army the Hay bill—the national-defense act of 1916—is the best measure that has ever been written on the statute books of this Republic. To that measure three amendments should be added, and that should stand as the peace-time Army Establishment of the United States of America. The measure before you, gentlemen, is the camouflaged General Staff bill that retains their full authority. In my judgment, the people of the United States do not need, do not demand, and do not want a great standing army. The ideals upon which our Republic stand really abhor the idea of military force in peace times, and yet gentlemen on this floor, like my able and genial friend from Washington [Mr. MILLER], who just addressed you, believe that this Republic ought to have a powerful standing army.

For what purpose? Did he tell us why we need this great establishment of which he speaks? Has he told you or anyone else why he believed in this idea of compulsory military service that he has been advocating in this time of peace? It is rather peculiar that since the armistice was signed, on the 11th of November, 1918, some people have advocated the greatest military establishment that the United States ever had and the biggest navy that floats the sea. The same people advocate a League of Nations, which, we are told, will cause us to disarm and to need neither soldiers nor war vessels. Can you arrive at by what kind of a process of ratiocination these gentlemen can reach such conclusions? To my utter surprise, the Secretary of War and the General Staff came before our committee soon after the armistice and wanted 576,000 soldiers. And gentlemen rushed in with forceful compulsory military service bills in time of peace. They even fooled the Secretary of War and had him advocate that nasty military mess before the Military Committees of the House and Senate, a thing he has opposed all his life, so far as I know, up until after we whipped the Germans.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not.

The Secretary of War wanted compulsory military service after we had crushed that system in Prussia by forcing the Germans and all their allies in the war to ground arms on November 11, 1918, and while the League of Nations was being formed. And I observe in the press that the Secretary of the Navy, my distinguished friend, Mr. Daniels, has been before the House Naval Committee and wants the greatest Navy that floats the seas. He wants 30 warships in an additional program now after we have whipped the Germans.

Whom is it we want to go out and fight now? Here we have been supposed to be the apostle of peace—the United States of America, with all her splendid citizenship, with her splendid clergy of all denominations, with the greatest churches of the earth, having their foremost exponents in every State of the Union, with the religion of our Lord and Christ, the sacrificial cross that stands before us all, and yet we have this horrid doctrine urged upon us by Members on this floor and by others in high authority. Why is it? Is it possible that I am behind the times? I am a young man. I have come up from the humble walks of life, through hardship, toil, and strife, and, God being my judge, every pulsation of my heart is honestly for the benefit of the poor of the human race. [Applause.] And neither by prayer nor by study, nor meditation, nor from history or the prophecies can I reach a conclusion that this glorious Republic, which I love, should go back on its history, back on its ideals, and found an autocracy built upon the force of militarism. And yet that is what is confronting the American people to-day. And why is it that men who are not influenced by that propaganda can reach the conclusion that after our brave boys have gone on the battleships as sailors, after they have gone as soldiers, wearing the uniform of this Nation, and have demonstrated to the world that a great united country

of 110,000,000 people can almost over night prepare its young manhood and gather up its husbanded resources of gold and can gather all the implements of peace and prosperity and mold them into war implements to destroy property and human life—why is it that any of our statesmen can believe that it is necessary to change our history and our traditions, and enter on a policy of the very thing that we declared war to overthrow, and organized the resources of this country and armed our young men to crush from the face of the earth? We can not fool the American people. Neither can we tamper at this period and juncture with such a dangerous foe as militarism.

Our people realize that the armed forces of the Kaiser, trained through this process of universal militarism for a period of about 50 years, was the real cause of this awful war that caused so much sorrow and death and destruction of property in the world. Yet we have good, sensible statesmen who stand on this floor and advocate it. Is it possible that my friends believe that with Germany disarmed, subjugated, with a great war debt that she must pay, with the Czecho-Slavs helpless, with Russia in the jaws of the Bolsheviks, with Italy over there on the point of starvation almost, with money values gone down to less than 50 cents on the dollar, the franc in France, the lire in Italy, the mark in Germany, and even the English pound sterling away below par, and the Russian ruble worth almost nothing, with disaster all over the world, with the people trying to come back—is it possible that statesmen propose to set up an enormous Military Establishment in the United States?

Is it for the purpose of frightening the world and having the whole world believe that the United States of America is a great roaring lion going about seeking whom he may devour? Surely statesmen do not believe there is any danger of that poor fellow over across the seas, that can hardly get enough to eat, raising a great army and financing himself and prosecuting a war against America, when he can not pay his debts now. Surely statesmen do not believe that there is anybody going to come down here from Canada. Surely the statesmen who are advocating this huge standing Army and the greatest Navy that the world ever saw must realize that because of war there has already been imposed on the backs of the American people \$35,000,000,000 in bonds, Treasury certificates, and other securities, thrift stamps, and war savings stamps, bearing interest from 3½ per cent to 4½ per cent. With those heavy obligations confronting us, these gentlemen advocate keeping up the greatest Military Establishment ever known, which will be an added and continued burden that will work an irreparable injury upon the finances of this country, as well as on the morals of the people.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield, although I would like to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. QUIN. They advocate this, notwithstanding the fact that we must get out of this debt that this war has put us into. They are talking "economy" in one breath, and the next moment they are coming and advocating the very thing that will make our expenses more than we can bear.

Let me ask you, gentlemen, who is to pay this enormous debt? It is true we are collecting enormous sums of money through income taxation and excess profits taxation from the rich of this country. Yet it has been necessary to reach out to every walk of life and tax the humblest citizen all that he can stand. And I want to say to you, gentlemen on that side of the House, that the only taxation that I ever heard of Republicans taking off since you came into power was the tax off soda water and ice cream—and I voted to take it off—to be paid by the poor little children that would go up to the soda fountain and drink; but some of you thought hard of it, and you turned right around and put a tariff on the buttons that the poor people wear, so that you do not deserve any credit for doing it. [Laughter.]

You are not trying to reduce taxation when you come up and advocate schemes and policies that will draw down harder on the backs of the people. In the last analysis who is going to pay all these war obligations? You do not get this money alone out of the pockets of the rich. The man who has great sums of money coming in from incomes does not miss it so much. But do you know that as far as possible those who are gathering in excess profits on incomes pass the tax on to the consuming public? It is the man in moderate circumstances, the man who earns his living in the sweat of his brow, who, in the last analysis, must pay most of this war debt that we have on us now.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Washington?



Mr. QUIN. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. QUIN. A further thing is that these gentlemen are going to put their money into United States Government bonds.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield. Scheming financiers and their politicians are in favor of freeing these bonds from taxation in order that the men who control the great wealth of this Republic will escape all of this immense war debt, and this future taxation that you propose to impose in order to pay for this large Army and Navy is to be put on the backs of the poor men and women of the United States who earn their living around the desks and on the farm and in the workshop or on the railroad trains or in the mines or in the sawmills and elsewhere. You need not endeavor to fool yourselves into believing that while we are making the people of large wealth pay all these expenses every man who has as much sense as a green lizard knows that the wealthy classes of this country are smart enough to make every effort to control legislation and, if possible, get the bonds of the United States finally exempted from taxation, and the bulk of wealth of this country, controlled by the very rich people, will be made free of taxation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. QUIN. I would rather not; I would love to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. QUIN. And knowing at the same time that the plain people of the United States will be forced to bear the burdens of this war which our people so vigorously and patriotically prosecuted and won. And as for this so-called "preparedness" in time of peace, after we won the war, is it possible that if the League of Nations is the great panacea for war and is to stop all men's minds from going in the wrong direction, the American Congress will still go ahead with a great Military Establishment and this huge Navy that the Secretary of the Navy is talking about? Who is going to believe that it is necessary? [Applause.] When the Germans get ready, and get paid all their debts and war indemnities, and get themselves back where they want to be, they may go back over there and fight the French and try to take Alsace and Lorraine again. Everybody who has been over there has formed an opinion. Do you want to bind our young manhood and go over and fight for France? There may be a little war coming over there about Fiume. Do you wish to go to the farms and muster an American army and go over and fight for the Jugo-Slavs, or the Russians, or anybody else? I do not. Then let us pursue a course which will preserve peace by turning away at every point from all tendencies to militarism.

Our people in the future will determine the policy which they desire this Government to pursue. Our people do not believe in imperialism. The masses will not stand for that horrid doctrine. If the United States Government is going to continue to be a Republic of the people; if this Nation is going to stand for high ideals, to stand for the church of the living God, to carry the torch of liberty on land and sea, to stand as an exponent of a free people, we must continue with the best ideals for which this Republic has stood. We can not carry that doctrine to the world if we have a soldier strapped on the back of every laboring man and farmer in the United States. You can not carry that doctrine to the world if you are going to have a testament in one hand and a rifle or a sword or a package of dumdum bullets in the other. This Republic can not be both flesh and fowl. If it proposes to stand for the people, it must stand on that kind of a platform every day in the week and every night in the year. It can not advocate one policy one day and shift to another the next day. Our country can defend itself, as it has demonstrated in the past, whenever it becomes necessary to do it.

With this national-defense act that we have on the statute books, that so soon as peace is declared becomes automatically the law of the land, by adding the chemical-warfare provision to it and something for the flying part of the Army, and by modernizing the articles of war so that they are no longer a relic of barbarism, we will have this country ready for any emergency. Our manhood does not need to be drilled by training for two or three years in the Army to go out to defend our Nation. The great standing army of Russia, that was so long the pride of the Czar, is where to-day? Bolshevism is running wild and rampant. The Czar's head is cut off, and he is laid away in his grave, and even the innocent members of his family are there. That is what a great standing army did for him and for Russia. And here in the United States, with 110,000,000 people, with practically no Army, our people have continued free and happy, and there is prosperity all the way from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, from the Gulf of Mexico clear to the Canadian border, our ships plying on the seas carrying commerce to the nations of

the earth, the fine cotton grown in the South carried across the sea and our wheat carried from the granaries of the West to feed the starving peoples of the world. Everywhere the American flag is respected and honored, because they know this is not a selfish Nation, not based upon force, but a Nation that stands for honor, justice, and liberty to all the peoples of the world. The national-defense act gives us all the Army we need—175,000 men, with about 11,444 officers, and can be built up at the order of the President when an emergency arises to 400,000 men. Does any man in the United States believe this Republic would be in danger with that splendid law that is so elastic, with good, well-trained officers? The National Guard under that act is properly cared for. The national-defense act, I believe, keeps in the city of Washington about 57 officers as members of the General Staff. There ought not to be over 35 or 40 of them, for the actual good of this Nation. Thirty-five or 40 members of the General Staff kept in the city of Washington to make plans and to advise are for the best interests of this Nation.

I believe in highly educated Army officers. Among those men we have patriotism. You need not doubt that. Occasionally we have some selfish man in that organization, as we do in all other walks of life, but as a general proposition they are honest, good, patriotic men. I will say that it ought to be further amended by adding a provision in this particular bill under discussion that the Chief of the Bureau for the National Guard should be from the National Guard of some State of this Union. With our Military Establishment properly cared for under the provisions of the national-defense act with modernized articles of war, under which brute force and barbarism will not govern the trial of officers and men, our Republic will be safe. Nobody need fear that anybody will ever run over the people of the United States.

But some folks say "we must have compulsory military service," and even the majority of our committee voted that in. But after this vote they heard a still, small voice. That night it made them have a vision, and the next morning they marched in, and in a low voice they said, "We will bury this compulsory universal military training feature." [Applause.] Now, why was that done? Oh, the mockery and sham of it. They knew the American people would not stand for that abomination. They knew the Republicans in this House would vote them down just like the Democrats did in their caucus. They knew they could not add that enormous expense to this Government now. They can camouflage figures. Although some people say figures will not lie, you know the man can lie who makes the figures, and that is what they are doing on the cost of this thing of compulsory training or compulsory military service, or whatever you please to call it. It is a very costly experiment. They realize that if they once get the nose of that camel inside the tent they are going to have the camel clear inside with a whole lot of kids around it in a very short time. Why, under that bill my friend from California [Mr. KAHN] would have all these niggers down in Mississippi and the South gathered up out of the cotton fields and grain fields where they are making food and clothing for the world, and it would send these Senegambians into a camp to educate them to be military artists and soldiers. Why will you take these laborers away from their work?

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I would love to, but I have not the time.

Mr. KAHN. I wondered if that was the Senegambian in the woodpile, why the gentleman is against military training?

Mr. QUIN. I would be against it if there never was a nigger in this country, because I love the people. I do not propose in an independent, free Republic to make slaves out of the young men. Whenever you take a young man from the farm or the workshop or school and put him into a military camp in the Army for three months or four months or six months or two years, eight times out of ten you unfit that boy for the balance of his life for the work that he is cut out to do. You ruin him as a farmer. He does not want to go back to hard work again. That boy will want to sit up in an office and draw about \$200 a month for doing nothing. You can not take these young men away from the schools to which they are going, and away from their work, whether it is in the shops or in the stores or on the farms, and expect them, after they have a taste of idleness, after they hear the music of the military bands in the camp, after they see the fine-looking officers with shoulder straps—you can not expect them to be willing to go back to the farm and say, "Whoa, haw, get up." [Laughter.] I tell you we can not afford to ruin the young manhood of the Union.

Some say that we are going to educate them. In every State in this Union you have a splendid system of public schools. People who own property pay a school tax. In McComb City, where I live, we have as fine public schools as there are in the



world, and poor children go to those schools. Men who own property, whether they have children or not, are taxed to support the schools and educate the poor. It is the duty of every municipality, city, county, and State to maintain that system. With such a system, where is the man who loves the Republic that believes you ought to take the power of the Federal Government, grab this great school system by the throat, grab the young men by the nape of their necks, and put them in the camp and say that the Government will educate them? For what? They are fooling the boy; they are educating him to be a soldier.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. No; I can not yield; I have so little time. With somebody pulling the strings to bring on a war, the young men that they have fooled into this kind of an education would be again grabbed and put into an army, marched across the country or floated across the seas or taken by airplane through the air to fight some unknown enemy that he never heard of and had no hard feelings against.

We must realize what we are up against. Do not you know that there was an admiral of the Navy who almost brought on a real war between us and Huerta overnight because Huerta's ship commander would not fire a salute? Probably he did not have powder enough to get home. [Laughter.] But because he would not fire the salute we almost declared war against Mexico. So you see that the American Government can get into a war before it knows it. For that reason—that some man in high authority in our Government might desire war if it is certain that the war dogs are ready—you do not want to be too well prepared for war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. MILLER were given leave to extend their remarks.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, after the eloquent remarks of gentlemen who have preceded me my words will seem weak and powerless.

During the World's Fair in Chicago, nearly 30 years ago, amongst the thousands of paintings exhibited in the Building of Fine Arts, my attention was attracted above all other pictures to a canvas about 20 by 30 inches, showing an old farmer with a cloth gripsack in his hand. He wore boots. Maybe that one was run over at the heel; certainly they were not polished like an officer's. A woman, plainly a farmer's wife, stood upon that homely doorstep giving the last caress to a farmer boy of perhaps 21. Just three pathetic figures. The picture was entitled "Breaking Home Ties," and was later awarded highest honor. So the enduring prize will ever be given to principles which picture the American home. From there comes all our Nation's power. Every dollar of this twenty-six billion debt must be raised upon the industry and privation of all housewives, who may milk cows and work the butter with a cedar paddle or in some simple drudgery gather and pay this enormous sum by small amounts. There is no evasion of the facts. Every step of civilization and progress is supported by patient, intelligent toil. Military training camps wean a boy from willing work to the ambition of war maneuvers and high rank. Our future depends upon production of the farm home. Never in history was military training so little needed, while rural life is needing and deserving encouragement. Military training was not necessary when our country was weak. While we grew strong and powerful beyond compare, monarchies and kingdoms, thrones and dynasties were decaying to make room for poor men and women, who ever find God's greatest blessing in the joy of work.

America prospered because labor had some recognition. You must encourage home building, lighten the burdens in every way, plan bringing back to the soil the young men. When the boy starts military training he has left the farm forever. The girls quietly follow toward the city. Do not desert the certain, proven rules for our greatness to satisfy a clamor for the military, a frame of mind which this war has produced. Turn back before too late. We should, and labor will, take hold cheerfully and pay the debt. But meanwhile rich men must practice self-denial.

Labor must have incentive, recognition, and the reward of home. Luxury, ease, and idleness may be taxed from existence. Let all go to work and pay for the war we have had before starting another, because military training is a certain path to war.

Until the war of 1917 we were told that our form of government was only an experiment and would not stand the strain, causing some uneasiness regarding compulsory universal military training, but now, with other forms of government changed many times while ours endures, having given ours the acid test, with all other nations in the financial discard, we are urged to

expend billions before the veterans of that war have had their pay. Reward your present soldiers before increasing the Army. As we got along so well without universal training against men trained to the minute, how can you claim to need training against all the other nations crippled? We were safe when Europe was strong and armed to the teeth. From where our numbers were few we lived to see Europe strewn with crowns and fading military vanity. From where now does this great demand for a large Army come? I will venture the opinion that the 18,000 new-made millionaires are unanimous that more boys come from the farms patriotic to the last drop of their sturdy youth.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. Is the gentleman aware that the American Legion, which represents 1,600,000 ex-soldiers of the World War, are for universal training?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. I am aware that they are not unanimously for it.

Mr. KAHN. A large majority have declared themselves for it.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. The officers, yes.

Mr. KAHN. And the men.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Not the privates.

Mr. KAHN. Has the gentleman heard the statement made by the committee who appeared before the Senate committee a few days ago, and who declared that they represented the private soldiers and officers?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. I am aware of it.

Some States enlisted a large percentage of their population, who left their State and went to war willingly, not one-half of whom have returned to the State. Of our vast cash subscriptions gladly advanced during war times, not a dime has come back. Yes; war does stimulate trade and huge bank balances, but it tends to impoverish the home. Training camps wean away and to a large degree destroy in boys' minds that reverence for home. Your Nation must now and forever rely for strength upon the American home. Your legislation must consider measures which encourage youth to build and maintain their own homes. For every boy leaving home, some girl follows away. It is difficult to imagine a home throughout our country where the living conditions of our girls are not superior to that which we find here amongst so-called women war workers. These young women were brought here under false pretenses; pictures of fine dormitories and alluring prospects, which did not exist—left here with small pay and no recognition, to do the best they can, their future insecure.

What nation fears us?

Without fear there can be no war. [Applause.]

I yield to no man in my intense admiration for our great Army, firmly believing that without compulsory universal military training our future security is best served.

The greatest quality of mind is self-reliance and should be cultivated in the individual, diffusing through the home into the township, county, and State, stimulating those atoms to depending upon their own individual and united energy without governmental interference and parentalism.

Our present rather unsettled condition is the result of pride which precedes a fall. We have had a tumble from vain positions and must realize that progress and food only result from hard, consistent work. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the discussion this afternoon has been not only interesting but illuminating. I think, particularly as it has shown the attitude of mind held by various gentlemen with relation not only to the matter under consideration in the bill but with regard to matters about which the bill itself is utterly silent.

Sometimes criticism is made that general debate is of no significance, that the fact is evidenced by the very meager attendance. Yet I think anyone who will listen to the general debate on bills of such magnitude as the one before us, unless he be an expert in matters of this kind, will have his knowledge very much increased, and possibly his views modified and his general information with regard to legislation made of some worth to his constituents.

We are discussing an Army bill this afternoon. I suppose that the gentlemen who have criticized the Army and war would not undertake to say that any civilized country anywhere could get along without an army. If it were not a necessity born of the inherent weakness, ambition, and viciousness of certain phases of human society, we would have no occasion for the reorganization of the Army in this country.

I shall not hope to throw any light upon the bill, but any man who has been in Congress since the war began must have had his judgment challenged again and again with regard to what is

wise, with regard to what is necessary, without consideration perhaps as to what is at the moment popular.

It was my privilege during the continuation of the war to visit one of our largest military camps. Personally I had never come in contact with any member of any considerable rank in the Regular Army. I was born and reared in an atmosphere which taught that all war was wrong, that even for the purposes of self-defense, under the teachings of the Master, there could be no occasion in which any man is justified in making war or put his means or talents to its ongoing.

While I had, I think, intellectually outgrown that conception, yet there lingered in my mind a prejudice deep and abiding against our Regular Military Establishment.

It was my privilege to visit one of the largest camps during the war. The general in charge told me that suddenly within four days 10,000 men had been stricken with the influenza. He had capacity for only 2,000 in his hospital. The day I arrived there men were dying at the rate of 77 per day, and it continued at that rate until the peak was reached. I said to myself, "What a fearful responsibility rests upon a man who has charge of 60,000 men," and I wondered what kind of man he was. When I went to the hostess house, within two or three minutes I was able to find exactly the location of the one to whom I had been called. I found him in a hospital, well taken care of. I remained there four days without anyone knowing that I was a Member of Congress. Accidentally one day it was discovered that I was a Member of the House. Immediately those who were in touch with the general said, "Have you seen him?" Nothing would do but that I must go and pay him a visit. I was ignorant at that time of how sensitive, how anxious these men in responsible positions are with regard to the conduct of the things that they have under them. I was introduced to the general who had charge. I was struck not only by his executive ability, but I was forcibly struck with the human element, with the heart that was in the man. Yet that man said to me, "I came back here to take charge of this camp, and some of my friends said, 'We are mighty glad to see you,' and then I said to them, 'My God, men, why didn't you say so before?' I have been here before, and I have ridden on the trains, and I never wear my uniform unless I am compelled to, and men have met me in the sleeper and in the smoking room, and even the first thought was, 'You are at a butcher's trade.'" Yet that man had given 20 years of his life to the study of the artillery of the world, and when the day came that we needed the man, here was one who understood the German system, the French system, the English system, who knew what to do and how to do it. All honor to the boys who fought the war, but it seems to me that it is about time we recognize that that group of untrained men, drawn into the camps, did not automatically organize themselves into a great army that won the war. That gallant body of trained men of the Regular Army who knew how to do things organized that army, and without them the story would have been different. [Applause.] So I made up my mind if opportunity ever offered legitimately I would speak the name of Gen. Austin, who had command of that Artillery camp, and who impressed me as the equal, at least in intelligence, in conscience, in heart of any man on the floor of this House.

Let us be fair. I know the Regular Army idea was different from ours, and I can understand it. We spoke just recently here about units being broken up that had been taken from a locality. The Regular Army ideal is this: Between certain ages and with certain physical qualities, if you can take the young men and have complete control of them, disassociate them from local situations, you can make them live, move, and have their being in the Army, and they will make the most effective fighting machine known to the world. If that were the only consideration, they are absolutely correct, but our ideals conflict with that. To my own mind it is not the thing that we should do. I am not a military man. I have only touched at a tangent the National Guard. Two of my sons served three years each in the National Guard, and that National Guard company was taken to the border, and then this fight between the National Guard officers and those of the Regular Army began, and I confess to you that I was unable to determine from my meager knowledge the exact merits of the controversy, although some of my own personal friends—in fact, all in Army life of my own personal friends—were of the National Guard. A strange thing did happen, however. That company and a large part of that regiment that spent the time down on the border drilling thoroughly never got across to the other side except in the very last days of the war, which showed either that the National Guard had been absolutely incompetent and that therefore they were not prepared or that there had been blundering on the part of those who managed the war

when they forced in men sometimes who had not had more than two or three weeks of training.

But it was not my purpose to criticize. It may be that the idea that I have with regard to the reserve force is a foolish one, but I believe that the hope of this country is in the love that the boy has for the locality in which he grew up, for the local associations that gathered around him in the formative days of his life, and that, although that might not make as effective an automatic fighting machine as those who have been called from every part of the country, yet when the testing time would come we can better trust to regiments, to companies that have been gotten together in particular neighborhoods that have been officered by men who will feel the responsibility of local criticism in respect to their treatment of the men. [Applause.]

A National Guard organization that would permit regiments to be formed in the congressional districts and officered by men in that district, so far as competent men could be found, would secure that unity of feeling and local pride in the organization that would make each community feel a proprietary interest in that much of the Army. A regiment thus organized would be proud of its history and around it would gather traditions of individual valor. Sons could be members of organizations in which their fathers had served. The training for the most part could be conducted at such times and places as would permit members of the family to witness the evolutions of the troops. The soldiers themselves would ever be conscious of civic duties as well as military. They would have before them always the very object for which an army exists—the defense of the home.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, during the war and since the signing of the armistice we have heard the statesmen, the pulpit, the platform orator, and the press all proclaim why we went to war with Germany. They have all given various reasons. Some said it was to make the world safe for democracy; others have said it was to pay a long-standing debt to France; while others, in fact most, say it was to crush forever militarism. I have always felt, and never hesitated to say, that we went to war with Germany because we had to as a matter of self-defense or self-protection. [Applause.] But, be that as it may, the speaker or writer, after giving his own particular reason why we went to war, almost invariably will say to further and forever crush out Prussian militarism. That was and is a common saying and reason, and it is based on good grounds, for article 173 of the proposed treaty with Germany provides:

Universal compulsory military service shall be abolished in Germany. The German Army may only be constituted and recruited by means of voluntary enlistment.

So there would be no question that Germany must understand that she was not to have military training going on in any manner. They put another prohibition against it by adopting article 177, which reads:

Educational establishments, the universities, societies of discharged soldiers, shooting or touring clubs, and, generally speaking, associations of every description, whatever be the age of their members, must not occupy themselves with any military matters. In particular they will be forbidden to instruct or exercise their members or to allow them to be instructed or exercised in the profession or use of arms.

That shows the feeling of the allied nations toward military autocracy. Our own Nation, through its representatives at this peace conference, helped to frame these provisions of that treaty, and I feel at least 70 to 75 per cent of our citizens indorsed their action and proclaimed "Well done."

But what do we confront to-day? We have the other 25 or 30 per cent, before this treaty is even ratified, using every means to establish the same system in this Nation. If it was bad to allow this system to remain intact in Germany, then why, I ask, can it be considered a good system for the United States?

I am not in favor of going as far in this country as did the framers of the treaty with Germany; I say, if the universities and colleges want to adopt military training as a part of their curriculum and let those who want to voluntarily enter it do so and receive the training, all well and good; but I am opposed to conscription during times of peace, and universal compulsory military training is nothing less than that. [Applause.]

If I were an ardent supporter of universal compulsory military training, I certainly would not be in favor of it at this time.

There can be no well-founded argument that it is necessary, as a matter of preparedness, for any immediate emergency or



supposed emergency, for we are better prepared now, so far as well-trained man power is concerned, than any nation on earth—so it is not needed for that reason.

One of the greatest difficulties the world is facing to-day is underproduction. It is true in European countries, and it is also true in this country. Especially is this the case in the agricultural sections of the country. Labor was never so scarce on the farms. I am told thousands of boys taken from the farm and trained during the war have not returned to the farm, and never will. This may be due partly to high wages paid in the cities, but something at least has caused many former farm boys not to return to farm life after their service, and to such an extent it is alarming. To adopt either of the bills proposed it would take anywhere from seven hundred and fifty thousand to a million young men from four to five months of a year away from the farm, the factory, and fields of production, and place them in military camps, where they would be consumers and not producers.

True, these bills provide for four months of the year for training, but it will take a little time to get ready to go and also some time in returning from camp; but that is not all. The short period of four months would not have been suggested but for the fact that those who are ardently supporting these measures felt they might be able to get that kind of a measure passed, knowing it would be impossible to get one with a longer period of training. Let me say, if the proponents of universal military training ever get a bill through Congress providing for four months' training, with all or practically all the metropolitan press and various defense societies and militarists behind it, within a short time they will get one through providing for two years' training. I have heard Army officers here in Washington say we must eventually come to this.

In addition to the foregoing reasons, and many more I could assign, why should the already overburdened taxpayer be called on at this time to increase his burdens for this system? No one seems to give an accurate statement or even nearly so as to what the adoption of this system would cost. It is estimated \$125 to \$350 per man for this training. I have figures from a conservative officer giving an itemized account as follows:

Pay	\$20.00
Transportation	50.00
Subsistence	63.60
Fuel, light	8.06
Quartermaster supplies and equipment	72.00
Clothing and equipage	69.76
Transportation, supplies	3.25
Water disposal (garbage)	3.65
Maintenance of transportation, rolling kitchens, ranges	2.12
Ordnance	17.60
Signal	2.10
Medical	5.05
Telegrams	.18
Rental and damages	2.25
Total	319.62

Which, I understand, has since been revised and is now about \$348.

This does not include hundreds of millions of dollars for military establishments in which to train these boys, and millions more for the expense of the administration of it here in Washington. Therefore taking into consideration the figures of the military experts, as given and our experience heretofore with such figures, I would say add at least 50 per cent to these estimates and you may be close to right.

I do not hesitate to say it will cost from \$340 to \$350 to train each man for the period of four months, which means the training of 750,000 to 1,000,000 men at a cost of anywhere from two hundred and fifty millions to three hundred millions a year. And all this for what? To get ready for the next war, or just to give these young men a good physical training, as the militarist would have you believe? If it is to give physical training, why is it they take only the physically perfect and deny the youth who needs the physical training the privilege of it? We all know they will not take the physically weak, but only the strong.

There are many other ways they can get this physical training. I am not opposed to providing all that is necessary for any youth to take military training who wants to take it; but I am opposed to compelling him to take it in times of peace. I felt this way about it a few days ago when privileged to introduce a resolution in my party caucus declaring against it, in this session of Congress, and which was adopted by almost seven to one. I wish the Members of this House of the Republican Party would also show the courage to do likewise, if not in caucus then during the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that this bill will never pass the Senate, nor any other bill for that matter, during this session of Congress which does not have in it a provision for universal compulsory military training. This bill will be given no

consideration by the Senate whatever; but the measure known as the Wadsworth bill will be substituted for this, or there will be no legislation during this session of Congress in the way of reorganization of the military affairs of this country.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Well, if we pass this bill and the Senate passes a reorganization bill of their own, will it not go to conference?

Mr. AYRES. Most certainly.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We do not have to accept their bill.

Mr. AYRES. That is why I say that unless there is a bill passed by the Senate containing a provision for compulsory military training there will be no reorganization legislation passed during this session of Congress, in my opinion, as the Senate intends to force universal compulsory training now or have no legislation.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. But if they pass one, it will go to conference, and then there will be a bill.

Mr. AYRES. Oh, well, we should go on record now, not wait for a conference to decide it nor till your national convention tells you what to do. This is your own individual responsibility as a Member of this House, and you should have the courage to meet it one way or the other, so far as this Congress is concerned. None of us can speak for the next Congress only as individuals; but the people of our respective districts will decide that matter as to whether they want a man to represent them in Congress on this question who does not hesitate to say where he stands, or one who would prefer to dodge the issue until after the election. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, ordinarily, under the great personal sorrow I have suffered within the last few days, I would be very much disinclined to participate in this discussion, but there is one feature in this bill that I have endeavored to give some attention to for several weeks that I desire to call to the attention of the committee, and that is with reference to the proposition involved in the bill providing for a permanent scheme of promotion in the Regular Army of the United States. It is a matter of very great and vital importance not only to the morale of the Army but to the men personally, and, as I see it, in the future the success of the esprit de corps of the officers of the Army of the United States. It is in a large measure a technical matter, and it is one that I fear has not been given very much consideration by the ordinary run of the Members of the House. You are aware that for a number of years promotions in the Army were made by regiments. For instance, a regiment that had a large number of old officers who might soon be retired, younger men, anxious to be promoted in the service, by influence or by personal solicitation or by good fortune, would be assigned to those regiments where there would be a number of vacancies, and by that method those who had these fortunate assignments—although they may not have been officers of superior intelligence or ability over their fellows—were fortunate in securing a rapid promotion. It was a great injustice to their fellow officers. Later on a system was devised to attempt to correct this injustice and inequality by making promotions according to the several branches of the service, and that system has been found to give very great dissatisfaction. Now an effort is being made in the bill which is up for consideration and which has been presented here by the Committee on Military Affairs that hereafter in the promotion scheme of officers in the Army of the United States to provide what is called a single list for promotions, and the committee has reported—I believe it is section 24a of the bill and some following sections—provisions seeking to carry out the general policy of a single list for promotions based upon the total length of actual commissioned service.

And, gentlemen, that is, as a matter of fact, the only correct policy and the only fair system that could be adopted by the Congress of the United States, because it gives absolute justice, absolute equity, to every officer in the Army of the United States. But unfortunately the committee in making its recommendations to this House and in preparing the draft of this bill has absolutely emasculated that principle and that policy by the exceptions it has made to the principle, and that is the proposition to which I desire to call the attention of the committee, and at an appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to eliminate certain language of the provision that has been suggested by the committee.

Now, on page 31 of the bill you will find this section makes up a list for future promotions. It provides that officers below the grade of colonel in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Vet-



erinary Corps, and enumerating all branches of the service, who were originally appointed in the Regular Army or Philippine Scouts prior to April 6, 1917, shall be arranged without changing the present order of officers.

And here is the objectionable language, gentlemen of the committee. Here is where the injustice comes in. Here is where the joker appears which vitiates the real principle that the committee is seeking to write into the bill when they used this language:

Shall be arranged without changing the present order of officers on the lineal list of their own branches, but otherwise as nearly as practicable according to the length of commissioned service.

Now, what is the effect of that language? The committee comes in here and says that they have after long deliberation come to the conclusion that the logical, fair, and just system of promotion, for the future promotion of officers of the Army, should be on the basis of a single line, arranged according to the total active commissioned service of the various officers. That is what they ought to do, but when they put in this proviso that they shall be arranged without changing the present order of officers on the lineal list of their own branches they absolutely vitiate their own principle, and it leaves men subject to the injustice they have endured for 20 years.

Take that large type of men who volunteered for services in the Spanish-American War before we had any draft. I have knowledge of this, because my youngest brother, if you will pardon a personal reference, was in that service, and it applies not only to that class but applies to hundreds of other officers of the United States who went into that war, and some of them served for one, two, or three years in the Volunteer service of the United States. There are hundreds of them. What is the effect of the proposition here pending? When the act of February 28, 1901, was passed they sought to correct the injustice that had existed theretofore, and it also appeared in that act, which under the construction of the War Department at that time absolutely put these men not on the lineal list according to the total length of the actual commissioned service, as the act on its face appeared to do, but put men as blocks and stops to promotion, based on that system; and if you carry this bill into effect and put these men on the list and do not recognize the total of active commissioned service of these other officers of the United States, we are going to perpetuate an injustice that has existed for 20 years, by which these commissioned officers have been penalized in rank and grade and pay and everything, and which means everything to the officers of the United States Army.

Mr. DONOVAN. Do you contend by this proviso it will keep them segregated in their several classes for the lineal pay?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Absolutely carrying out the old-established system of partiality, and there can not any member on the Military Affairs Committee dispute the correctness of that assertion? What is their answer? They say this injustice has existed so long that if you now undertake to correct the injustice that has existed for 20 years it will create dissatisfaction on the part of those officers affected. You might as well say that if a man were innocently convicted and put in the penitentiary and it was discovered that he was absolutely innocent, that he had become accustomed and reconciled to it for so long that clemency should not be extended to him. What is the practical effect of the operation of that system? These men have been deprived of their proper number in the various ranks. They have been penalized in the salaries they draw in a large number of cases, and in their promotion, and this bill seeks to perpetuate for all time that injustice. To show further the inconsistency of the Military Committee, they absolutely make five different specific exceptions to the rule which they themselves seek to establish.

They can not deny that. It is a bill, gentlemen, which, seeking to do one thing and declaring in favor of a certain specific policy, immediately thereafter puts in provisions giving favoritism to certain officers and certain groups, giving favoritism to them in their arrangements on the permanent lineal list that is to be made up; and, gentlemen, when the time comes, as I say, when this section shall be reached in the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule, I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the following words: "Without changing the present order of officers on the lineal list of their own branches," so that this list for permanent promotion shall be based fairly and squarely, without any exception, upon the basis of an officer's total actual commissioned service in the Army of the United States, whether with the Volunteers or otherwise.

I have conferred privately with some members of the committee and even in debate here on the floor I do not think they will deny the abstract justice of the position which I am assuming

upon this bill. Their answer is one of a specious nature. Their answer is one of expediency. Their answer is that these men when they went in knew the position they were going to be assigned to, which is not an absolutely accurate statement of the facts. But when it comes down to the calm, searching analysis of the principle that they are seeking to invoke in this bill, I say they ought to stand by that principle without exception, and then hereafter every officer in the Army of the United States will know just exactly where he stands. He will know what his future is, and he will know that hereafter, neither by legislation nor by personal influence, will officers of equal capacity and equal merit be penalized under the provisions of any legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Porto Rico is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DAVILA. Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in this bill which refers to the Porto Rican Regiment of Infantry, and I think I should be derelict in my duty should I not take the floor of the House to emphasize the justice and wisdom of this provision. I refer to section 20, which reads as follows:

The Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry and the officers and enlisted men of such regiment shall become a part of the Infantry branch herein provided for, and its officers shall, on July 1, 1920, be recommissioned in the Infantry with their present grades and dates of rank, unless promoted on that date in accordance with the provisions of section 23 hereof.

Almost ever since the establishment of the Porto Rico Regiment we have vainly knocked at the doors of the War Department and of Congress asking for the incorporation of the regiment of Porto Rico into the Regular Army with the same rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of every member of the United States Army.

As organized by the act of 1916, the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry is a part of the permanent establishment of the United States Army, but the officers are entitled to promotion to and including the grade of lieutenant colonel only. This is an injustice. The officers should be transferred, as provided in this bill, to the lineal list of the Infantry as the only solution to the present stagnation, since the officers are not only confined to eternal service in Porto Rico but have no outlook, no incentive in their careers on account of the block which regimental promotion entails for them. These officers of the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry are men who belong to our most distinguished families, and they are not second in their devotion to duty and loyalty to the flag to any officer in the United States Army. [Applause.]

These officers have made the Army their profession and lifelong occupation, having already devoted to it the best of their lives, many years of most efficient, loyal, faithful, and hard tropical service. They have been admitted into the regiment by passing the same moral, mental, professional, and physical examination for entrance and promotion as required in the Regular Army. About one-half of them are professional men—civil, electrical, mechanical, sanitary engineers, lawyers, teachers, accountants, graduates of first-class American and European colleges and universities. They have practically shown their ability and military qualifications, and they are entitled to be transferred into the lineal list of the Infantry. Soon after his visit to Porto Rico in 1913 the Member of the House, Hon. D. R. ANTHONY, relating to the Porto Rican Regiment, said:

From what I could see I was convinced that the Porto Rico Regiment was one of the best Infantry regiments in the Army, and the good work of the officers and men, which has made the regiment such a splendid one, is deserving of recognition on the part of the Government.

On the floor of the House Representative ANTHONY said, among other things:

The Porto Rico Regiment is one of the finest in our Army. Its officers, both American and Porto Rican, are a splendid lot of men, the equal of others of their rank in other branches of the service, and so deserving of the same privileges and opportunities for promotion.

During the Great War the Porto Rico Regiment was detailed to the Canal Zone, and it is unnecessary to exalt the important duties rendered by our men in that place. They were faithful, loyal, true to the national cause, and for their efficiency, ability, and devotion to duty they highly enjoyed the confidence of their superiors. Now, in accordance with this provision of the bill our regiment shall become a part of the Infantry, with the same footing of the continental American soldier. This satisfies entirely our aspirations. We can not willingly accept any discrimination between continental Americans and American citizens born in the island of Porto Rico.



We are entitled to the same rights, privileges, and immunities of every citizen of the United States, and on every occasion when we see that the policy of the United States tends to treat us as fellow citizens we feel a sincere sentiment of reciprocity and our love and devotion to the Nation grows stronger in our hearts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Porto Rico has expired.

Mr. DAVILA. May I have one minute more?

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Porto Rico is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. DAVILA. The provision included in this bill recognizes our rights and will be an incentive to the officers of our regiment, and I am sure that you will not repent of this act of justice, which will be received with great enthusiasm by the Porto Rican people. That is what we want, equal rights and equal duties, equal burden and equal advantages under the American flag. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman yield back?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 5.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CULLEN, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. RAINEY of Alabama, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that every gentleman who has spoken or may speak in general debate on this bill may have leave to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken or may speak on the bill may have leave to revise and extend their remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does my colleague mean to limit it to remarks spoken by those who have engaged in general debate or during the progress of the debate on the bill?

Mr. KAHN. In general debate.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from California, Why not extend that to every Member of the House who desires to extend his remarks on this bill?

Mr. KAHN. I have no objection to that, but I thought it should be confined to this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; if the gentleman will confine it to the bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Has the gentleman any objection to the extension of remarks which have not been fully developed during the progress of the debate under the five-minute rule?

Mr. KAHN. No.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman include that?

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent that every gentleman who addresses the committee on this bill, whether in general debate or under the five-minute rule, may have leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent that every Member of the House have leave to print on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama adds to the request that every Member, whether he speak or not, may have the privilege of extending remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KAHN. On the bill. I modify my request to include that.

Mr. WALSH. I object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects to that. The Chair will put it in the other form. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that all those who have spoken or who may speak on the bill may extend remarks on the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman from California think he ought to limit that to five legislative days?

Mr. KAHN. I will limit it to that.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman is that all Members who have spoken or who may speak on the bill may extend their remarks on the bill for five legislative days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I object to that.

The SPEAKER. Consent has been granted.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On March 1, 1920:

H. R. 6863. An act to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

On March 4, 1920:

H. R. 12351. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River, in Halifax County, N. C.

On March 6, 1920:

H. R. 12046. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore made, adjourned until Tuesday, March 9, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed amendment to requested legislation to enable vessels, wherever built, purchased from the United States Government, to be documented as vessels of the United States, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WOODS of Virginia, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12911) to provide for an investigation and report upon the condition of the Chain Bridge, across the Potomac River, and the preparation of plans for a bridge to take the place thereof should it be deemed necessary, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 721), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. FOCHT, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2749) for the relief of legal



representatives of Dr. W. D. Barnett, deceased, late of Cleveland County, Ark., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 723), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2420) for relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Schiffer, deceased, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 724), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of Arthur J. Coney, sole heir of L. J. Coney, deceased, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 725), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of E. F. Mathews, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 726), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3216) for the relief of the heirs of Isabella Ann Fluker, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 727), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3519) for the relief of David C. McGee, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 728), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1813) making an appropriation to compensate Samuel Grant for pay, bounty, and clothing pay while in the service of the Government of the United States, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 729), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1817) for the relief of Eliza Audre, daughter of Maria Colston, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 730), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12550) granting a pension to Harry L. Evans; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12575) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Posey; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 12969) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12970) to provide a fund from which to pay the expenses incident to soldier-relief legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 12971) regulating the practice of chiropractic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12972) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 12973) for the preparation of additional rolls, allotment of lands, disposition of the lands and funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 12974) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to Darby Township, Delaware County, Pa., a captured cannon or fieldpiece and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12975) to provide for the retirement of United States park policemen after 25 years of service, and for a pension in case of total disability; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12976) to increase the revenue of the Government of the United States and to conserve the supply of print and other paper by imposing a tax upon advertisers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12977) to amend sections 4, 8, and 10 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended, relating to naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12978) to provide for the care of certain insane citizens of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 12979) authorizing the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians in Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12980) to authorize allotments of lands to Indians of the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WELTY: Resolution (H. Res. 490) asking for copies of correspondence from the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: Resolution (H. Res. 491) calling for information from the War Department concerning motor trucks or tractors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the continuance of work at the Watertown Arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, urging immediate appropriation by Congress of a sufficient sum to carry out provision of the act approved June 29, 1888, entitled "An act to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, by dumping or otherwise, and to punish and prevent such offenses"; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROWAN: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, urging immediate appropriation by Congress of a sufficient sum to carry out provision of the act approved June 29, 1888, entitled "An act to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, by dumping or otherwise, and to punish and prevent such offenses"; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 12981) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an allotment to Pessa, a member of the Comanche Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 12982) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12983) granting a pension to Earl Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 12984) granting a pension to Jasper E. Glascock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 12985) granting a pension to Sullivan W. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12986) granting a pension to George B. Petteys; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 12987) granting a pension to Edward Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12988) for the relief of Robert Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12989) granting a pension to Helen L. Barzee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12990) granting a pension to John H. Gonderman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12991) granting an increase of pension to Estella Rearick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12992) granting a pension to Caroline Leasure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 12993) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Haynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2151. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of a mass meeting of Armenians of Philadelphia, favoring the independence of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2152. By Mr. BEGG: Resolution of Tiffin Post, No. 169, American Legion of Ohio, Tiffin, Ohio, urging additional bonus in the form of a \$50 bond for each month of service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2153. Also, petition of the Tiffin Post, No. 169, the American Legion, relative to adjusted compensation for ex-service men and women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2154. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging the recognition by the United States of the independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2155. By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the city council of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the restoration of the mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2156. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of sundry ex-service men of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the bonus bill as recommended by the American Legion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2157. By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the committee on military and naval affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the retention of Camp Dodge as a military post, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2158. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Hartford citizens of Armenian blood, protesting against partition of Armenia and against the massacre of Armenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2159. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of citizens of Michigan, urging appropriation for the starving people of Europe; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2160. Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, relative to the Army reorganization bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2161. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Everett Herter Post, No. 760, of the American Legion, New York, urging the passage of the Wadsworth bill, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2162. Also, petition of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, relative to agriculture appropriations, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2163. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the improvement in the Patent Office, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2164. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Everett Hunter Post, No. 760, of the American Legion, New York City, favoring the Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2165. Also, petition of L. O. Rothschild, New York City, opposing bonus to ex-service men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2166. Also, petition of Cooper Underwear Co., urging amendment of immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2167. Also, petition of Edward T. Devine and the Methodist Federation for Social Service, both of New York City, favoring the passage of the Sterling-Lehlbach bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

2168. Also, petition of Hooker Electrochemical Co., of New York, favoring the continuation of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2169. Also, petition of National Foreign Trade Council, representing 18 commercial organizations of New York, protesting against the proposed destruction of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce through insufficient appropriations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2170. Also, petition of the Grasselli Chemical Co., of New York, urging adoption of measures helpful to the country's foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2171. Also, petition of Institute of American Meat Packers, relating to the Kenyon-Kendrick and Gronna bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2172. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, asking for adequate appropriations for maintaining agencies working for increased agricultural production and rural betterment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2173. By Mr. STEENERS: Petition of William H. Borchart and 104 other citizens, of Mentor, Minn., protesting against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2174. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the National Industrial Conference Board, of Boston, Mass., urging Federal commission, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2175. Also, petition of Charles W. Wright, of Lynn, Mass., urging relief for the contractors, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2176. Also, petition of the Boston Trades Council, Boston, Mass., opposing the Army reorganization bill, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2177. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Department of the Army and Navy Union of the United States, urging the passage of the Shreve bill, House bill No. 6862; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2178. Also, petition of citizens of Boston and Charlestown, Mass., relative to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2179. Also, petition of the National Cannery Association, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the repeal of the excess profit tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2180. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., urging relief for the destitute countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2181. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Women's Auxiliary of Newburg, N. Dak., protesting against universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 9, 1920.

(Legislative day of Monday, March 8, 1920.)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

### TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McLean	Shields
Ball	Hale	McNary	Simmons
Borah	Harris	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Harrison	Myers	Smith, Md.
Capper	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Owen	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phelan	Trammell
Edge	Keyes	Philips	Wadsworth
Elkins	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Poinceter	Walsh, Mont.
France	Knox	Pomerene	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Ransdell	Watson
Gay	Lodge	Reed	Williams
Glass	McCormick	Sheppard	
Gore	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think I have ever troubled the Senate by rising to a question of personal privilege, and I do not want to dignify what I am about to say as anything so important; but there is a correction which I feel bound to make of a statement which appeared in the newspapers this morning.

Yesterday by many representatives of newspapers I was asked if I had anything to say in regard to the letter of the President. I replied to them one and all that I had no comment to make. This morning I see it stated in the Washington Post, and in quotation marks, that I said there was a delightful passage in the President's letter in regard to France. Of course I said nothing of the kind. I did not allude to any passage in the letter at all, and if I had alluded to the President's reference to France "delightful" is the last word I should have said, even in irony, for it was not a case for irony.

I think what the President said about France was most unfortunate. He said:

Throughout the sessions of the conference in Paris it was evident that a militaristic party, under the most influential leadership, was seeking to gain ascendancy in the counsels of France. They were defeated then, but are in control now.

I do not think that that is something which ought to be said about France. I believe it, as a matter of fact, to be unfounded. I think the reverse is the case, and I regret extremely such a reflection upon one of our associates in the war with Germany.

I have tried personally in these debates to avoid any reflection upon the powers with which we were associated in the Great War. Some criticism perhaps was unavoidable, but I should like to take this occasion to repeat what I have said before, that